

regulate the residence within the United States, its Territories, and all possessions and all territory under its jurisdiction, and the District of Columbia, of Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I rise to take the floor with the intention of discussing the Chinese-exclusion bill at 2 o'clock to-morrow, at which time, as I understand, it will come up as the unfinished business.

#### INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that to-morrow morning, immediately after the routine business, I shall call up the Indian appropriation bill.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, April 4, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3, 1902.*

##### APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

###### Infantry Arm.

Edward J. Bloom, at large, to be second lieutenant, February 2, 1901.

##### PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

###### Infantry Arm.

Capt. Edward H. Browne, First Infantry, to be major, March 28, 1902, vice Clagett, Second Infantry, deceased.

##### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

William R. Akers, of Nebraska, to be receiver of public moneys at Alliance, Nebr., his term having expired. (Reappointment.)

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 3, 1902.*

##### PENSION AGENT.

Augustus J. Hoitt, of Massachusetts, to be pension agent at Boston, Mass.

##### POSTMASTERS.

Burd R. Linder, to be postmaster at Orwigsburg, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania.

Daniel W. Bedea, to be postmaster at Shenandoah, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania.

Jesse N. Watson, to be postmaster at Hatboro, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

Robert B. Clayton, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania.

Louis Biltz, to be postmaster at Girardville, in the county of Schuylkill and State of Pennsylvania.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, April 3, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

##### REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, with Mr. OLMSTED in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] occupy some of his time?

Mr. MANN. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, a few evenings ago an employee in one of the departments of the Government came to see me, it being his fourth or fifth visit, to request that I should use whatever influence I might have to retain him in the Government service; a laudable ambition, to remain in the employ of the Government.

That same evening another employee spoke to me relative to supporting the pending bill. I suggested that the passage of this

bill meant the commencement of a civil pension list, and that I thought the results of it would open up an immense drain upon the Treasury. The reply to my suggestions was that when a clerk in the employ of the Government gives to the Government many years of his service that the Government ought to place him upon a civil pension list.

In these two incidents we have brought forth fully to our attention the condition in which the Government is placed. A strenuous effort at all times is being made to get into the Government service, and when once in office a strenuous effort is made to increase the salary and to establish an opening into the public Treasury. The title of the pending bill is "To promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service." I dare say that that is misleading. I have listened very attentively during the past few days to the speeches in advocacy of this measure, and I have heard no intimation or suggestion that the Revenue-Cutter Service was inefficient. I have heard no argument protesting that it needed improvement. Every suggestion that has been made and every argument that has been offered has been that the service is very efficient and that the service is rendering a perfect service.

Why, then, should this bill be styled a bill to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service. When we turn to the bill itself we find in it no provision whatever, no suggestion whatever, to increase the efficiency of the service. No new duty is prescribed; no irregularity in the service is sought to be remedied. The only purpose of the bill is to open a way to higher salaries and to establish a pension list. The bill divides itself into three branches. First, to increase the rank of the officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service. To this I have no objection. If there should be any comfort in having a provision to place upon themselves more tinsel and to make a more gorgeous display, I have no objection whatever to offer to that.

The next provision is to increase the pay of all the officers in the service; but no suggestion is made to increase the pay of the common laborers engaged in the service. The next suggestion is to place these officers upon a retired list at an increased pay. Under the law as it now exists they are subject to retirement at one-half pay. This is to be increased to three-fourths pay; so that under the operation of the present law a captain who was retired at \$1,250 a year under the proposed law will be retired at \$2,625 a year; in other words, an increased pension from more than \$100 to more than \$200 a month. In addition to this there are commutations allowed to the different officers under existing law ranging from \$40 down to \$20 per month. This is increased in the pending bill to \$48 down to \$24 per month.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we increase the pay of the Revenue-Cutter Service by the passage of this bill, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Life-Saving Service, a service which is just as commendable, that can present itself as forcefully and with just as many reasons and arguments in its behalf, stands knocking at the door of the Congress demanding an increase in its pay and that it shall be placed upon a retired pension list. Then there is the Marine-Hospital Service, that is just as commendable, making like demands. There is the United States Fish Commission, marine service, and that is entitled to as much consideration. Then there is the Railway Mail Service, that is entitled and possesses as much merit as this Revenue-Cutter Service. Where will this policy end? It means, Mr. Chairman, but one thing. It means the establishment of a civil-pension list in this Government; and when we ever open that door, I venture the prophecy that but a few years will elapse until we have a pension list requiring \$500,000,000 of appropriation every year.

I wish to call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that at the present session the House has passed one law that has created the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau. This has added to the departments of the Government a large pay roll, amounting to a million dollars and more a year and an addition to the clerk hire of 1,000 or 1,200 clerks. There is pending in this body a ship-subsidy bill, another measure that is seeking to find an entrance into the Federal Treasury in order to donate unlimited millions of the money of the people, raised by taxation, to the classes in this country who are already in the wealthy class and have no need of the donation. Already we hear the demands upon the Congress for the establishment of a new department of commerce and labor that will necessitate the enlargement very much in the employment of clerks and will constitute an additional drain upon the Treasury. Many of these things, I wish to emphasize, are extravagances. We are in the era of extravagant and reckless expenditure of the public money. We are forgetting the fundamental principles of economy in Government. We are hoisting the anchor; we are letting the old ship of state drift away from economy into every extravagance conceivable to meet every demand made upon the Federal Treasury.

In this Revenue-Cutter Service we propose to increase the salaries of 221 officials, and we propose to increase the salary on the

retired list of 29 persons; and while this in the aggregate amounts to about \$156,000 per annum—comparatively a very small sum—yet it stands as an indication of what may be expected in the near future. It is the thin edge of the wedge entering the public Treasury toward the consummation of a plan to inaugurate in this country a permanent civil-pension list. I have here and shall print with my remarks the appropriations for the Army for the fiscal years from 1893 to 1902, inclusive, and the like appropriations for the Navy. I wish to call attention to the fact that the appropriations for the Navy for the fiscal years of 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896 were \$100,390,818.41. For 1899, 1900, 1901, and 1902, \$247,441,460.93. The appropriations for the same years—1893 to 1896—in the Army were \$95,379,632.37. For the years 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902 they amounted to \$678,380,001.18.

So that we have the total appropriations for the Army and Navy from 1893 to 1896, inclusive, of \$195,770,450, and for the years 1899 to 1902, inclusive, of \$925,821,000. The amount carried in the appropriation bill for the Army which has passed the House at the present session is \$90,880,000, and the estimates for the Navy are \$98,910,984, an increase in the estimates of more than \$11,000,000 over the year 1902 for the Navy alone.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that these facts ought to demand our serious attention and our earnest consideration, and they should impress upon us the necessity of calling a halt in the extravagance of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I shall also ask to print with my remarks the report which accompanies the pension appropriation bill setting forth the increase in the pensions. In 1879 the appropriations for pensions were \$33,000,000. In 1901 it was \$138,531,483, and added to that was \$3,787,693 for naval pensions, making more than \$142,000,000 disbursed in one year for our pension list. Is there no lesson for us in these figures? Have we forgotten that every dollar of money in the public Treasury comes through the exactions of taxation? Have we forgotten that in the establishment of this Government our fathers rested and grounded this Government upon the great fundamental principles of simplicity of government and economy of administration? But we have lost sight of this. We have forgotten the simplicity of our fathers; we have forgotten the economy of our fathers. We have cut loose from the spirit and genius of our institutions, and we are drifting away from them into every extravagance that could characterize a Federal administration.

Opposed to this the Democratic party stands forever pledged, and I wish to call to the attention of this House and to the attention of the country and to the attention of the Administration and the responsible authorities in this House that the time has come when we should begin to practice some measure of economy, and to have in view the fact that the money we are lavishly expending is derived from taxation of the people who earn their money by the sweat of their brow, and every dollar in the Federal Treasury is an exaction from labor and toil and the products of the masses of our citizenship. To-day, like in the olden time, as every road led to Rome, it seems that in the Congress of the United States under the present Administration, every road leads into the public Treasury. Let us return to the simplicity and the economy of our fathers, and turn away from this lavishness and extravagance that would constitute every Federal officeholder a pensioner upon the public Treasury and a burden upon the labor and toil and production of the American citizens. [Applause.]

The tables above alluded to are appended, as follows:

Appropriations for the Navy for the fiscal years—	
1893	\$23,543,385.00
1894	22,104,061.38
1895	25,327,126.72
1896	29,416,245.31
1897	30,562,690.95
1898	33,003,294.19
1899	54,068,793.68
1900	48,069,969.58
1901	65,140,916.67
1902	78,101,791.00
Total for the years 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896	100,390,818.41
Total for the years 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902	247,441,460.93
Appropriations for the Army for the fiscal years—	
1893	\$24,308,499.82
1894	24,225,639.78
1895	23,592,884.68
1896	23,252,608.09
1897	23,278,402.73
1898	23,129,344.30
1899	23,193,392.00
1900	329,661,795.77
1901	80,430,204.06
1902	15,140,464.70
Total for years 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896	115,734,049.10
Total for years 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902	465,379,632.37
Total appropriations for years 1893 to 1896 for Army and Navy	678,380,001.18
Total appropriations for years 1899 to 1902	925,821,402.11
Fiscal year 1903:	
Amount carried in appropriation bill for the Army	\$90,880,000.00
Estimates for the Navy	98,910,984.63
Increase of naval estimates over year 1902	11,738,553.87

#### Revenue-Cutter Service under existing law.

	Per annum.
37 captains, each at	\$2,500
37 first lieutenants, each at	1,800
37 second lieutenants, each at	1,500
37 third lieutenants, each at	1,200
1 captain engineers, at	2,500
35 chief engineers, each at	1,800
17 first assistant engineers, each at	1,500
18 second assistant engineers, each at	1,200
1 constructor, at	1,800

#### Retired list under existing law.

	Per year.
1 captain, at	\$2,500
4 captains, each at	1,250
4 first lieutenants, each at	900
1 second lieutenant, at	750
1 third lieutenant, at	600
9 chief engineers, each at	900
6 first assistant engineers, each at	750
3 second assistant engineers, each at	600

Under the pending bill the effect is to increase the salaries of the officers about 40 per cent, and it raises the salary of the retiring officer from one-half of the existing salary to three-fourths of the increased salary.

The Committee on Appropriations, in presenting the bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions for the fiscal year 1903, submit the following in explanation thereof:

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on page 197 of the Book of Estimates for 1903, and amount to \$139,846,480.

The accompanying bill appropriates \$139,842,230.

The following statement gives, by appropriate title of expenditure, the amounts appropriated for 1902, the estimates for 1903, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1903:

Title of expenditure.	Appropriations for 1902.	Estimates for 1903.	Recommended for 1903.
Payment of pensions	\$144,000,000	\$138,500,000	\$138,500,000
Fees of examining surgeons	700,000	800,000	800,000
Salaries of agents	72,000	72,000	72,000
Clerk hire at agencies	430,000	430,000	430,000
Stationery and other necessary expenses	30,750	35,000	30,750
Rent	12,480	9,480	9,480
Total	145,245,230	139,846,480	139,842,230

The following table, compiled from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the number of pensioners on the roll, the annual value of pensions, the disbursements on account of pensions, the number of applications filed, and the number of claims allowed each year from 1879 to 1901, inclusive:

Fiscal year.	Number of pensioners on the roll.	Annual value of pensions.	Disbursements on account of pensions.	Total number of applications filed.	Total number of claims allowed.
1879	242,755	\$25,493,742.15	\$23,664,428.92	57,118	31,946
1880	250,802	25,917,906.60	56,689,229.08	141,466	19,545
1881	268,830	28,769,967.46	50,583,405.35	31,116	27,394
1882	285,697	29,341,101.62	54,313,172.05	40,939	27,064
1883	303,658	32,245,192.43	60,427,573.81	48,776	38,162
1884	322,756	34,456,600.35	57,912,387.47	41,785	34,192
1885	345,125	38,960,985.28	65,171,937.12	40,918	35,767
1886	365,788	44,708,027.44	64,091,142.90	49,885	40,857
1887	406,007	52,824,641.22	73,752,997.08	72,465	55,194
1888	452,557	56,707,220.92	78,950,501.67	75,726	60,252
1889	489,725	64,246,552.36	88,842,720.58	81,220	51,921
1890	537,944	72,052,143.49	106,094,250.39	105,044	66,637
1891	676,160	89,247,200.20	117,312,690.50	696,941	156,486
1892	876,068	116,879,867.24	139,394,147.11	246,638	224,047
1893	966,012	130,510,179.34	156,906,637.94	119,361	121,630
1894	969,544	130,120,863.00	139,986,726.17	57,141	39,085
1895	970,524	130,048,365.00	139,807,788.78	45,361	39,185
1896	970,678	129,485,587.00	138,215,174.98	42,244	40,374
1897	976,014	129,795,428.00	139,949,717.35	50,585	50,101
1898	963,714	130,968,465.00	144,651,879.80	48,732	52,648
1899	991,519	131,617,961.00	138,355,652.95	53,881	37,077
1900	963,529	131,534,544.00	138,462,130.65	51,964	40,645
1901	997,735	131,568,216.00	138,531,483.84	58,373	44,868

The payments on account of Navy pensions during the fiscal year 1901 aggregated \$3,787,693.03, making total pensions paid in 1901 \$142,219,176.57.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a member of this House I have given a patient and courteous hearing to almost every speech that has been made upon this floor. In return for that patience and courtesy I beg the indulgence of the committee for a brief while on the pending measure. I would content myself with recording my vote against the bill were it not for the fact that requests have come to me from my State urging me to support it. I believe that a Representative should give patient and respectful consideration to any request from his constituents. There is no man, though never so poor and humble, whose wishes, even though of only one sentence contained upon a postal card, I would not receive respectfully and consider carefully. In the end, however, a Representative, having examined the subject, must follow his own conscience and judgment.

The friends of the Revenue-Cutter Service have certainly been active in this matter, for, so far as I know and have heard, the



only letters, petitions, and resolutions coming up to this House have been in favor of the bill. We have heard nothing from the great masses of the American people. They have been going about their business, and have not had time to analyze this bill and make known their views. They expect us to analyze the bill and to do our duty.

When it was brought to my attention that this bill, which professes to be a bill "to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service," would come before Congress for consideration, I supposed it meritorious. I know that I am in favor of promoting efficiency in all the departments of the Government service. Who is not? But what do I find in this bill, with its inviting, captivating, and misleading title? In my innocence I believe that language was made to reveal and not to conceal thoughts, and this is particularly true in regard to the titles of bills in legislative bodies. There is not one line or provision in the pending bill to improve the Revenue-Cutter Service. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, according to the advocates of this measure the Revenue-Cutter Service is the most efficient and worthy service in any department of the Government. The assertion here is that the service is practically perfect, or as nearly perfect as poor human nature can make anything. The most earnest and eloquent pleas are poured into our ears, and we are told that because of the efficiency and worth of the Revenue-Cutter Service this bill should be passed as an act of simple justice. I do not doubt that the officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service are courteous, efficient, and worthy gentlemen. I have nothing to say against them. They brave dangers and do their duty. So do thousands of other men, whether in or out of the public service.

Let us analyze this bill. Mr. Chairman, if the bill had no title and I were called upon to read it and to frame a title in one sentence that would convey a clear, definite idea of its provisions, in innocence and simple honesty, I would write this sentence: "A bill to increase the salary of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and to provide for their retirement on pay." This is the plain, simple English of this proposition. If the measure stopped at increasing the pay of these officers, we could debate it along the line as to whether we should increase the pay of Government employees. But, sir, beyond that, and of supreme importance in this discussion, is the principle involved in retiring men who are civil employees of the Government. Juggle with words as you may, justify it on what plea you will, the fact remains that by passing this bill you are creating a civil pension list. A civil pension list is obnoxious to every principle of republican government, and I pray that we may never see the day when one class of our people shall live in luxury and ease out of the public Treasury at the expense of the masses of the people, and that, too, without even the pretense that they are engaged in Government work.

Whether the civil pension list you shall create by the passage of this bill will be long or short will be immaterial. Whether the sum necessary to pay the salaries of the retired officers shall be large or small will make no difference. Whether that list shall contain 10, 500, or 5,000 men who never served their Government except as civilians, you will have a civil pension list. You will have a precedent. There are enough lawyers in this body to know the force and the power of precedent. When we go into court with a clearly established precedent, a like decision is forthcoming. Having passed this measure upon the plea of doing justice to this class of Government employees, I ask you what will be your answer when the Life-Saving Service come for similar treatment? They can say, and truthfully, too, that their lives are lives of hardship, peril, and danger. There is no smooth sailing for them. When the seas are angry and the waves are furious, and great ships laden with human souls are dashed like toys upon the rocks, the Life-Saving Service, unconscious of self, risk their lives to save others. Listen to the strong language contained in a Senate report setting forth the merits of the Life-Saving Service. The report says:

When the severe toils, bitter privations, and appalling dangers incident to their calling are considered, and when it is remembered that the spirit with which these hardships have been met has resulted in the saving of thousands of lives and an amount of property many times exceeding in value the cost of maintaining the service, while the history of their achievements has added luster to the national honor, it would seem that the higher rates would not be too great a reward to bestow on these faithful and heroic men. At all events, a substantial increase should be made.

As a consequence of their exposure many men have fallen victims to chronic ailments, some have been maimed for life by accidents, and others have perished on their beats. It is probably safe to say that there is no other class of men engaged in duties at once so tedious and perilous as those which these faithful guardians of the coast perform in maintaining the unremitting night patrol throughout the rigorous season of the year. But their labors are not confined to this routine of watch patrol and daily drill. Summoned in the dead of night, or by day in the midst of their ordinary toil to a duty higher than these, by an alarm that a vessel is ashore, they take their places at the boat wagon or apparatus cart for a supreme effort, with a courage and determination that has never yet quailed before any hazard, and executed

prodigies of valor and endurance that have made them celebrated throughout the land and added to the nation's glory.

In addition to the foregoing regular routine must be added their terrible and daring labors at shipwreck. This, of course, is their crowning duty, and involves efforts almost superhuman, heroism carried to the very brink of deadly peril, and often death itself.

The soldier in this age is known and is only justified as one who professionally stakes his life in defense of his fellow-citizens. It is because he does this that, grown veteran or infirm or falling on the battlefield, we recognize his right and the right of his family to support at the expense of the public he guards. These life-saving crews—these storm soldiers—render a similar service, and no less dangerous and noble, and they deserve the same substantial recognition.

In another Senate report, made at this session of Congress, it is said that—

these officers in their official routine are exposed to hardships and dangers which do not fall to the lot of the ordinary officeholder.

Measured by their merits or by the danger of their calling, the Life-Saving Service is as much entitled to a civil pension list as the Revenue-Cutter Service.

The Weather Bureau men will come asking for like treatment, and they will be able to present arguments which no man who votes for the pending measure can answer. The Revenue-Cutter men are at anchor in some smooth harbor on an average of more than three hundred days in the year; but the Weather Bureau men will be able to tell you that they work every day in the year; that their labors begin before the dawn and continue until midnight; that they must endure all climates, from Alaska to the equator. I need not stop to repeat the arguments that they will be able to make, for I find that a committee of the Fifty-sixth Congress summarized the reasons why there should be a retired or civil pension list for the Weather Bureau employees, and I can not do better than to repeat what they have said:

(1) They work three hundred and sixty-five days in a year. Their hours of duty are long. On the Pacific coast the first observation is made between 4.30 and 5.30 a. m., while on the Atlantic coast the offices can not be closed before 11 p. m., and often later. They must be on the alert at all times to detect the first premonitions of storm development, and remain constantly on duty in order to distribute warnings that may be received at any moment.

(2) They are subject to great vicissitudes of climate, being required to serve, as the exigencies of the service may require, in almost any degree of latitude, from Alaska to the West Indies.

(3) By reason of the peculiar organization of the service its employees are, like officers of the Army, in a great measure deterred from obtaining a fixed habitation or enjoying the privileges that accrue to long residence in a community. Changes of station generally operate to their financial disadvantage.

There you have it. They are not soldiers, but they serve the Government under great hardship, are always on duty, and, like soldiers, are constantly moving from place to place, are denied the social privileges and advantages accruing to long and fixed residence, and are subject to financial loss by constant change of residence. Being like soldiers, the argument is that they should be accorded like treatment.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is easy to see the drift and the tendency. Unfortunately, and, as I think, unwisely, we have a retired list of Army and Navy officers. To-day we are called upon to give the Revenue-Cutter Service a retired list because, forsooth, they perform duty like soldiers. The extracts from which I have read characterize the Life-Saving Service as "storm soldiers" and the Weather Bureau men as "like soldiers." All this is but laying the foundation to provide for them a retired list because there is an Army retired list.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] is paving the way for the Marine-Hospital Service to be pensioned. He has introduced the bill (H. R. 7189) which I hold in my hand, and, while it provides for an increase in pay, it is entitled "An act to increase the efficiency," etc. I tell you, gentlemen, we must watch these titles. Judging by the title of the bill now under consideration, as well as by the title of the one which I hold in my hand, I am sure I can say without offense that if some gentlemen here were to draw up a bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States courts, they are so thoroughly imbued with the idea of promoting or increasing the efficiency of the service that it would never occur to them to entitle their bill as a bill to increase the salary of judges of the United States courts, but I should expect a bill "to promote the efficiency of the courts."

This bill relating to the Hospital Service provides that the President may, in time of war, transfer this service to the Army. Having provided by law that this service may be pressed into the Army in time of war, you have laid the foundation to create for it a retired or civil pension list. Then, Mr. Chairman, what are you going to do about the railway postal clerks? They constitute one of the most worthy and efficient classes in the Government service. They work hard and they work constantly, and what is more, they are in infinitely more danger than the officers of either the Navy or the Army. It is a fearful thought and an appalling fact that when the railway postal clerk kisses his wife or his sweetheart good-bye he goes out from her presence with some doubt as to whether he will ever return. I have great respect for



this great army of employees. I believe that of all the bills here providing for an increase of salary of Government employees—and there are bills providing for increase in salary for nearly everyone in the Government service—the bill providing for an increase in the pay of postal clerks is about the only one of merit. When you get fairly launched into your civil pension business you will find yourselves in no position to refuse to heed the arguments that will be poured into your ears in behalf of other Government employees.

The Life-Saving Service, the Weather Bureau service, and the railway postal clerks can all show that their work is as arduous as the work of the Revenue-Cutter Service. They can show you that more men lose their lives each year in the Life-Saving Service, in the Weather Bureau service, and in the railway postal service than have lost their lives in forty years in the Revenue-Cutter Service. And when you shall have yielded to the pressure that will be brought to bear from all these sources, and placed the old and the infirm and the maimed upon the retired or civil pension list, then your lives will be made miserable by the clamor of the department employees here in Washington. Why, gentlemen, do you know that an association has been formed in this city for the purpose of securing legislation providing that all Government employees, here or elsewhere, incapacitated for labor, shall be placed on a civil pension list, or a retired list, if you prefer to call it by that name? Let me tell you, if you pass this bill all the other employees of the Government will some day get similar legislation. All they want is a precedent and one class in the Government service retired on pay. Then they will come, telling you that they worked for the Government during the best years of their lives, and ask that justice be done them by according them the same treatment accorded other Government employees.

There are only two arguments in favor of this bill, namely, (1) that the employees demanding this legislation are worthy, and (2) that this legislation is necessary to equalize them with Army and Navy officers; and such will be the arguments when like bills come before this body for consideration for other Government employees—that they are worthy and that such legislation is necessary to equalize them with other favored employees.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing I was about to forget. The friends of this bill say that the Revenue-Cutter Service employees are subject to the call of their country in times of grim-visaged war. That is so; but so is every other man. The lawyer in his office, the plowman in his field, the operative at his loom, the merchant in his store, the miner in the earth, the fisherman by the sea, and all men everywhere are subject to their country's call in the hour of danger, and that call will be obeyed.

All this talk about justice to these overworked and underpaid employees of the Government sounds very well. These employees were not conscripted into the service. They are not in involuntary servitude. They can resign. With all the world before them, they, of their own free will and accord, with full knowledge of the work and of the pay, sought these positions and hold on to them tenaciously. There is another class to whom we should do justice, and that is those who pay the taxes. It is time to call a halt in these wild and extravagant expenditures of public money. In 1860 the entire expenses of the Federal Government were in round numbers \$82,000,000. The expenses of the present fiscal year will reach \$730,000,000. The total appropriations for the Navy for the years 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896 amounted to \$100,000,000. The total appropriations for the Navy for the years 1899, 1900, 1901, and 1902 amounted to \$247,000,000. The total appropriations for the Army for the years 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896 amounted to \$95,000,000. The total appropriations for the Army for the years 1899, 1900, 1901, and 1902 amounted to \$678,000,000.

Every dollar in the Treasury is exacted in the way of taxation from the American people, and these dollars represent the toil and the sweat of those who eat bread in the sweat of their faces. I wish to be parliamentary, but I must confess that I have little patience over the tears that are shed in behalf of the overworked and underpaid employees of the Government. These employees went into the Government service voluntarily, and in most instances worried their Representatives and Senators to death to get the places. I undertake to say that most of your constituents and mine work longer hours, receive less pay, and have fewer of the luxuries than the Government employees. A captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service gets \$2,500 a year. This bill raises his salary to \$3,500 a year, and provides for his retirement in certain emergencies on a salary of \$2,625 a year for life. Compare these wages with what your people and mine back home are making, and answer your own conscience if you think it is right to tax the people to pay such salaries, and then to pay men on a retired list who do not render nor pretend to render any service to the Government more than \$200 per month for life out of the public Treasury.

I have heretofore referred to the fact that there were bills

pending in this Congress to provide for increase of pay for almost all the employees of the Government. I take the liberty of quoting from the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who has carefully compiled the bills of this character. Bills for increase of salaries pending March 1, 1902, in the Senate and House of Representatives of the Fifty-seventh Congress:

- S. 943. To reclassify railway postal clerks and to increase their salaries.
- H. R. 27. To reclassify railway postal clerks and divide them into ten classes and to increase their salaries.
- S. 1345. To classify post-office clerks and to grant them an annual increase in salary of \$100 per annum.
- H. R. 5286. To provide for the classification of salaries of clerks employed in first and second class post-offices and to increase the salaries of such clerks.
- H. R. 5597. To increase the compensation of fourth-class postmasters.
- S. 237. To increase the pay of letter carriers.
- H. R. 2575. To increase the pay of letter carriers.
- H. R. 6279. To increase the pay of letter carriers.
- H. R. 6548. To increase the pay of letter carriers in cities to \$1,200 per annum and to increase the pay of rural carriers to \$1,000 per annum.
- H. R. 7213. To increase the pay of letter carriers.
- S. 3267. To increase the pay of judges of the Supreme Court and other courts of the United States.
- H. R. 205. To increase the salaries of judges of the Supreme Court and other courts of the United States.
- H. R. 5816. To increase the salaries of the Vice-President, judges of the Supreme Court, and members of Congress.
- H. R. 6284. To increase the salary of the Vice-President to \$25,000 and Cabinet officers to \$15,000 per annum.
- S. 1026. To increase the compensation of district superintendents in the Life-Saving Service.
- H. R. 76. To increase the compensation of district superintendents in the Life-Saving Service.
- H. R. 197. To increase the compensation of district superintendents in the Life-Saving Service.
- H. R. —. To grant an increase of 10 per cent for each five years' service to all persons in the classified service.

Let us not forget that the fathers who founded this Government based it upon the idea of simplicity and economical administration. In many things the tendency and the drift are away from the simple democracy of the fathers. Let us retrace our steps. Let us understand, and endeavor to make all other men understand, that men temporarily in the public service are but public servants and are no better than the men in private life. There is no place here for classes. The genius and the spirit of our institutions stand out against such legislation. If this Government is simple in its manner, economical in its expenditures, and fair and impartial in its administration, it will be strong in the affections of the people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as I think I have some knowledge of a practical nature of the service affected by this bill and know its value and efficiency, the character and quality of the men engaged therein, I rather feel bound to make some suggestions relating thereto. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON], who join in the minority views against the report of the committee on this bill, apparently have given some time in investigation for the purpose of ascertaining the merits of this measure. The gentleman from Illinois informs us that he has spent about a year and a half in the investigation of this question. The gentleman from Alabama informs us in his speech that he has spent about all of his time since he has been on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in investigation of this measure.

Now, we know that to be practically true, with this exception: We do know that he has not spent the time on this measure that he has employed in conjunction with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS], who sits at my right, in alternately swatting the octopus concealed in the Pacific cable proposition [laughter]; but with this exception the gentleman from Alabama has spent his time in investigating this measure. I was very much surprised to hear the gentleman from Illinois, in his second speech on this proposition, express regret because the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY C. SMITH] had seen fit to make some reference to the Navy not altogether of a complimentary character. I was surprised, because of the fact that the minority views signed by the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Alabama, and the two speeches made by the gentleman from Illinois, to say nothing of the speech made by the gentleman from Alabama on four months' investigation, are simply seething and saturated with unfounded attacks and assaults upon the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Now, notwithstanding the fact that the gentleman from Illinois sees fit once in a while to say that they are courageous men, his speeches are, I say, saturated with villification of this service; and I say further, and I will reach it if I have time in the course of these remarks, that his speeches themselves show that many of his charges are absolutely without foundation. Moreover, they show further that he has distorted what he claims to be the facts for the purpose of making out what he claims as derogatory to this service. Now, what is this pending measure, and what does it do? It accomplishes, as I understand, simply four things. First, it simply makes the grades in the Revenue-Cutter Service



regular and consistent with the existing grades in the Navy. Second, it makes the Revenue-Cutter officers rank next with and next after the officers in the naval service in times of peace as well as in times of war. Now, upon that proposition the minority views, the result of a year and a half investigation and four months of study, say what? Why, they say that is unnecessary and useless in time of peace, and that it would be very injurious—I want to quote them exactly—it would be “exceedingly mischievous in time of war.”

I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that the provisions of this bill, so far as they relate to this service in time of war, are simply a reenactment of existing law which had been in existence long before the civil war, and instead of that provision operating with great mischievousness during the time of the civil war and the time of the Spanish war, it operated manifestly to the advantage of both the naval and the Revenue-Cutter services. Now, I do not say that the gentleman from Illinois, after eighteen months of investigation knows that fact; but if he had spent his time to any good purpose, he would have learned that that assertion of his was entirely without foundation. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh, yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman states that that provision of this bill is simply a reenactment of existing law?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is what I say.

Mr. MANN. Then, what is the purpose of having it in the bill?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. For the purpose of making this consistent with the existing law.

Mr. MANN. What is the use of putting a provision in the bill to reenact existing law?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do you deny that it is a reenactment of existing law?

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly, it is not a reenactment.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I make the absolute assertion and will stand by the record.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman himself has an amendment prepared for the very purpose of taking the provision out of the section that he is now talking about.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The gentleman has not any such amendment prepared.

Mr. MANN. Well, he had.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. He has not any such amendment prepared. Now, you notice what I talk about. Do not get unduly excited, because if you get excited at this stage, you will get annoyed later. Notice what I am talking about. I say that the law now provides that these revenue officers in time of war rank with and next after the officers that are described in this bill. I say that is a provision of the law, and it has been a provision, and I will read it:

The officers of the Revenue Service, when serving—

And this was the law prior to 1861—

in accordance with law as a part of the Navy, shall be entitled to relative rank as follows: Captains, with and next after lieutenants commanding the Navy; first lieutenants, with and next after lieutenants in the Navy; second lieutenants, with and next after masters in line in the Navy;

And the only change is to eliminate masters, and put in junior lieutenants, if I remember correctly—

third lieutenants, with and next after ensigns of the Navy.

And that has been the law, I say, since long prior to 1861.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to call his attention to the section of the bill itself?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Instead of saying “captains with and next after lieutenants commanding,” it says “captains with and next after lieutenant-commanders in the Navy,” which is an entirely different proposition.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What is that—with and next after lieutenants commanding?

Mr. MANN. With and next after lieutenant-commanders.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is simply a technical title that you call attention to.

Mr. MANN. That shows the gentleman is not informed about the law.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. No; it does not. It shows nothing of the kind.

Mr. HEPBURN. There is no such officer as a “lieutenant commanding.”

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that it shows nothing of the kind. Now, if the gentleman will just wait, as I go on I will call his attention to some other things that will interest him vastly more. I say that in substance this provision was in existence prior to 1861. I say that in substance this provision applied in 1861 and 1898, and I say that under it the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service and their vessels fired the first shot in each war, and there was not the slightest con-

dict, difficulty, or trouble. They operated together without any difficulty or trouble.

Mr. MANN. I do not wish to take the gentleman's time.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Well, then, I hope you will not take it; but go ahead.

Mr. MANN. I suppose you hope I will not.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. No; go right along.

Mr. MANN. The term “lieutenant-commander” is a term of rank. The term “lieutenant commanding” refers to the command of a vessel.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And in the recent war, according to the report of the Navy, there were a great many vessels commanded by officers below the rank of lieutenant-commanders.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But commanded by lieutenants commanding.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now you propose to eliminate that and make these captains subject only to lieutenant-commanders.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But superior to lieutenants commanding.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes. Was there any friction about that in the time of the war?

Mr. MANN. There was no friction, because the lieutenants commanding were always in command; but you propose to let revenue officers command lieutenants.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Did a captain rank with and next after a lieutenant-commander in the Navy in the time of the war?

Mr. MANN. He did not.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Did a first lieutenant rank with and next after lieutenants in the Navy?

Mr. MANN. He did not.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Did a second lieutenant rank with and next after a master in the Navy?

Mr. MANN. He did not, so far as command of a vessel is concerned.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have just read from the statute that says he did. That simply shows that the gentleman from Illinois is a trifle off his base.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman will take care of himself on that proposition.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have no doubt he will. I am very glad to see him do it. He has endeavored to take care of himself in these minority views on this bill and in these speeches he has made on this bill, and I will show the House, if I have time, how well he has succeeded in accomplishing that little job.

Now, there are two other things this bill accomplishes. And what are they, which these gentlemen are so violently opposed to? The bill gives to the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service longevity pay and the same privileges, in substance, as to retirement that are now given to officers in the Navy and in the Army.

I am not going to stop here to discuss the question of a civil pension list or the propriety of the retirement proposition in connection with the Army and the Navy. I shall assume for the purposes of what I may say here that it is the settled policy of this Government to promote and continue its policy in connection with the retiring of officers in the Navy and in the Army. The only question here pending in this bill is whether or not the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service as to services are in every substantial respect identical with those of similar officers in the Navy. If they are, they are entitled to the same treatment.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman kindly yield to me?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman kindly explain what the difference is between the compensation under this bill of a captain—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Now, I hope the gentleman will wait until I get to that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. What is the difference between the pay of a captain corresponding in rank to a lieutenant-commander? Will the gentleman explain that difference?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will not stop now. If I have time I will do so later. First, I will discuss something that will interest the gentleman a great deal more than these trivial suggestions about rank.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. This bill is to give equality in rank and pay.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Now, I want you to explain the difference between the pay of the officer in the Revenue-Cutter Service corresponding in rank to lieutenant-commander?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I decline to yield to the gentleman from Alabama at this time for that purpose. If I have time before I finish I will explain what the gentleman thinks is a mare's nest,

what he said in his speech was the "cloven foot," the result, I have no doubt, of four months' reflection upon the service. I will refer to that a little later, if I have time; but I am now discussing another point in this bill, and I decline to be drawn from it.

I say if these officers stand on equal footing, are substantially identical in service with the officers in the Navy, they are entitled to the same treatment and ought to receive longevity pay and retirement that the officers of the Navy have; and I say that it now being a part of the policy of this country to give the officers of the Navy that retirement on account of their naval services, it properly withdraws and distinguishes them from the class of civil employees of the Government. I am opposed to enlarging the civil pension list. I do not believe in giving civil pensions.

The gentleman from South Carolina says that he discovered that this bill was constructed and was originated mainly for the purpose of increasing the civil pensions and the civil list, and then the gentleman from Tennessee said this morning that he saw the thin edge of a civil-pension list. It had a tendency, so he said, to in some way affect the ship-subsidy bill. In what way it was done he did not say. I do not know. It had a tendency, he said, to send the great ship of state very near the rocks and breakers. That is the thin edge that the gentleman from California is opposed to in this bill, because he did not like to open a civil-pension list; and for that reason, in his remarks, the gentleman from Indiana, whom I see near me, and whose remarks I have not seen, because he has not extended them in the RECORD, I understand is opposed to this bill, because it is a thin edge and opening up a civil-pension list. Now, I think I am opposed as much—I do not know, of course, how a man really feels from his speech—but I am, I think, as much opposed to a civil-pension list as either of these distinguished gentlemen.

I do not think there is any danger of the ship of state going on the breakers if this bill passes, because I do not believe on any fair and proper analysis, by any inspection of the provisions of the bill by ordinary human reasoning, without misrepresentation or misapprehension, that the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service can be said to be in any proper sense civil employees. I have great respect and admiration for the Navy; I think no man has more—and if there was any line or syllable in this bill that tended in any way to derogate from the honor of the officers of the American Navy, or that tended to impair their efficiency in the discharge of their duties either in time of peace or of war, I would vote against the bill. But there is nothing of the kind.

If I can demonstrate, as I think I can, that these officers stand upon a par with the officers of the Navy, they are entitled to the same treatment. I grant you that it does not answer the suggestions made by the gentleman from California or the suggestions made on the floor the other day by gentlemen who said that they were opposed to the whole retirement proposition—that they do not believe there ought to be any retired list. I do not stop to answer that proposition. That question I submit now to the consideration and judgment of the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Alabama, who, as it was asserted yesterday by the gentleman from North Carolina, had never even been on the deck of a revenue cutter, and I do not know that they ever saw a revenue cutter. But as to the judgment of these distinguished gentlemen, and I make no reflection upon their intelligence, their honesty, or their judgment, I propose to submit that the great weight of authority on this question as to identity of service is against them.

I say that the great preponderance of authority does not sustain my distinguished friends in their opposition to this bill, and I propose to read from the report of Secretary Chandler, a report which I think perhaps my friends, although they spent this time and exercised their great abilities, did not succeed in unearthing. Now, what does Secretary Chandler say? I will pause right here to say that there is no officer in the Navy, small or great, renowned or otherwise, that stands to-day, either directly or indirectly, challenging the propriety of this measure or opposed to its passage. They all full well understand the relation of this Revenue-Cutter Service to the United States and the absolute parallel that exists between the two services, and there is no man in the Navy so provincial, so selfish, or so narrow as to be opposed to this measure when he knows that it is founded on the same measure of justice and the same proposition of logic that applies to the retirement and longevity pay of the officers in the Navy.

There is Secretary Chandler, and what does he say? I shall not stop here to argue that it may be that Secretary Chandler knows as much about this service and the naval service as my friend from Illinois or my friend from Alabama, or my other friend from Alabama, who the other day was so awfully impregnated with the idea of a civil pension list, that tremendous ignis fatuus that seems to climb up over the footboard during the silent midnight watches and frighten them when they think of this bill.

Here is what Secretary Chandler said in 1883:

Of the rest—

Speaking of the duties of these officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service—

there is not one that is foreign to the general purpose and scope of the naval officer's profession.

Going on further, he says:

The duties of both services are identical in their general nature, only they operate in different localities. Both cruise to protect the maritime interests of the Government and to render assistance to American vessels—the one on the coast, the other, in addition, at sea and in foreign waters. One polices the shore, the other the ocean. In war both engage in naval operations.

The practical identity in the character of the naval and the Revenue-Marine Service lies in the fact that they are both nautical and both military.

Here is where they differ from civil employees.

That the Revenue Marine is a nautical service requires no proof. It is nothing if not nautical. That it is a military service was officially asserted by the Treasury Department in the report on the service for 1881, in these words:

The Revenue Marine, while charged by law with the performance of important civil duties, is essentially military in its character. Each vessel is provided with great guns and furnished with as full a complement of small arms for its crew as any ship of war. Its officers are required to be proficient in military drill and possess a thorough knowledge of the uses of both great and small arms. Its crews are required to be instructed from day to day at the great guns and in the use of the carbine, pistol, and cutlass. Commanding officers are required, while boarding vessels arriving in ports of the United States, in case of the failure or refusal of any such vessel, on being hailed, to come to and submit to the proper inspection by an officer of the service, to fire, first across her bows as a warning, and in case of persistent refusal to resort to shot or shell to compel obedience. In the performance of this work they are likely at any time to receive injuries and be subjected to the same dangers in time of peace as the force employed on naval vessels.

By the act of March 2, 1799, it is provided that "the revenue cutters shall, whenever the President so directs, cooperate with the Navy." It will be observed that the cooperation of the two services prescribed in the act above quoted is not contingent upon a state of war or other particularly perilous conditions. On the contrary, it may take place in time of peace and for pacific purposes, and when less hazard is involved in the two services than pertains to the discharge by a revenue vessel of its ordinary duties. \* \* \* It is difficult to conceive that discrimination could be made by the law between services subjected to equally hazardous and equally important military duties, both in time of peace and in time of war. \* \* \* Objection to granting pensions for the Revenue-Marine officers and seamen has been made on the ground that such action would be extending this bounty to civil employees of the Government, a policy to which our legislative traditions, so to speak, are opposed. But, if in legal theory they are civil employees, are they so in fact? Are they less positively a part of our military force in time of war than the Army or Navy? It is true revenue vessels are not to be ordered into action on purely military service, offensive or defensive, except the President so direct; neither are vessels of the Navy.

That Secretary Chandler is a man of intelligence and uses the English language with a full appreciation of its import and with great accuracy will not be denied, and here is what he says in comment:

The above clear and concise statement showing that the so-called revenue marine is simply a coast navy is without doubt correct and just, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Will the gentleman from New York extend my time for a few minutes?

Mr. SHERMAN. Will five minutes be enough?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Perhaps I can crowd what I wish to say into that time.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not see how I can give the gentleman more.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Very well.

Now, let me quote from the language of another Secretary of the Navy, also a man of ability and capacity, and who knows something of these services, Hon. Benjamin F. Tracy. He says in a letter dated February 29, 1892:

It seems hardly necessary here to point out the practical identity of the two services.

He then quotes with approval the extract which I have just read from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. In commenting upon the extract he says:

The similarity in the two employments amounts almost to identity.

Let me go a little further and quote something a little nearer to the present date. I wish to refer to the language of a Secretary of the Navy on whom gentlemen who oppose this bill have undertaken to rely. In the pursuit of information on this subject I have taken occasion to write a letter of inquiry to Hon. John D. Long, the present Secretary of the Navy, who most worthily maintains the dignity of that office, so that it is no reflection upon men who have preceded him to say that with his distinguished ability and high and exemplary character he has reflected great credit and honor on the administration of the Navy during the time he has had it in charge. [Applause.] I wrote to Secretary Long this letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, D. C., March 29, 1902.

HON. JOHN D. LONG,  
Secretary of the Navy.

DEAR SIR: I desire to call your attention to the bill S. 1025, to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, which is practically identical



with the bill H. R. 5796. The following amendment is proposed to be added to section 2 of the bill, viz:

"Provided further, That such assimilated rank shall not be construed to vest any officer of the Revenue-Cutter Service with the right to command any officer of the Navy or any naval vessel, nor shall any naval officer have the right to command any officer or vessel of the Revenue-Cutter Service, except by order of the President."

Will you be kind enough to examine the bill with the proposed amendment and advise me whether or not the Navy Department would have any objection thereto, assuming the amendment was adopted, and, if you feel at liberty to do so, make such suggestions as you desire with reference to the propriety of the measure?

Very respectfully,

C. E. LITTLEFIELD.

To this letter I received the following reply:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, March 31, 1902.

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the 29th instant with reference to the bill S. 1025, "To promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service," which is practically identical with H. R. 5796, and requesting an examination of the bill with an amendment proposed in your communication, and advice whether or not the Navy Department would object thereto in case the amendment should be adopted.

In reply you are advised that while this measure is a matter concerning the Treasury rather than the Navy Department, the special objection to it on the part of the latter is met if, either in the form suggested by you or otherwise, it be so amended as to provide that when officers of the Navy and officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service are serving together the whole shall be under the command of the senior naval officer present, and that in no case shall officers of the said service exercise command over vessels of the Navy.

Which is precisely what the amendment accomplishes.

With regard to your further request that I make such suggestions as I may desire to submit with reference to the general propriety of this measure, I beg to add that on account of the similarity of the two services—

Mark that language—the language of John D. Long—

on account of the similarity of the two services, their cooperation in time of war, and the possible future utility of the Revenue-Cutter vessels for naval purposes in time of peace in connection with the protection of American interests in foreign waters, it is clear that the Revenue-Cutter Service ought to be a branch of the naval establishment, as has frequently heretofore been proposed, and as, in the interests of a common range of service afloat, it certainly should be. Indeed, every argument in favor of the bill in question is an argument in favor of such a combination. It may be added that the bill seems to have a tendency toward that end, and if so the Navy Department would gladly approve it if amended as above suggested.

I have no doubt as to that question.

Such an arrangement, it is believed would be for the interests of the officers and enlisted of the Revenue-Cutter Service who have given many instances of skillful seamanship and great gallantry, and thus shown their aptitude for naval service; would put cognate branches under one head and thus promote harmony rather than friction and give both the same benefits; and would certainly tend to prevent the maintenance and possible gradual divergence of what has been called two navies with their separate costly organizations. I have no doubt that there may be some line of service in the Navy Department that could be properly turned over to some other department. I certainly believe that there are branches in other departments involving vessels afloat and closely allied to the naval service which on the other hand would be better if attached to the Navy Department, and that the Revenue-Cutter Service is one of them.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN D. LONG,  
Secretary.

HON. CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD, House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I wish I could have about three minutes longer.

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Now, Mr. Chairman, without any disrespect to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON], I submit that the great weight of authority sustains the proposition that these two services are identical.

A word in reply to my friend from South Carolina and other gentlemen who say that the passage of this bill would be opening the way to a civil-pension list. There is no department of the Government to which such a remark could have had less pertinence than to this service. There is no clerk who could be drawn from his regular service and detailed to go upon the firing line by order of the President of the United States; no man can be taken from the Marine-Hospital Service; no man can be taken from the Fish Commission; no man can be taken from the Post-Office Department, railway-mail clerk though he may be, and very much in love with that proposition though my friend from South Carolina may be. There is no department, there is no other service that stands on a parallel with this Department in that fundamental distinction of essential military character that exists between them.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman pardon me a moment?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I can not stop here. I have not the time. There is no department, I say, that can stand on a parallel with this in that respect. If I had the time, I would be glad to stop and discuss the Life-Saving Service, because in the line of hazardous and dangerous encounter the Life-Saving Service does stand on a parallel with that of the Revenue-Cutter Service. One of the great duties discharged by both services is to save life at the peril of their own lives. I have time only for just one suggestion that I want to make in connection with the two speeches of

my friend from Illinois. I said that the gentleman's speeches showed that he had no foundation for some of the assertions he made. I will call attention to this, and then I will leave this bill for the consideration of the members of the House. I call attention now to the assertion made by the gentleman from Illinois in his speech on Thursday last, in which he said this:

If the report of the Revenue-Cutter Service were published, it would show that no boat—

Now mark this—

no boat in the control of the Revenue-Cutter Service had its anchor weighed so much as eight days every month.

There is his record in his speech of Thursday last. I take up now and hold in my hand his speech of Tuesday last, in which he spreads himself over the RECORD to the tune of eighteen to twenty pages, and what do I find there? I find there are six boats that have a record of eight days' and more service in the month, so that there are six instances in his speech of Tuesday that show that the assertion that he, inadvertently no doubt, made in his speech of Thursday was entirely without foundation.

Now, let me go a little further. He has selected in these six instances only 21 of the 40 vessels engaged in the Revenue-Cutter Service. What of the other 19? What would they show with reference to having their anchors weighed more than eight days in any one month? I do not know, but I have no doubt the gentleman from Illinois does know. At any rate, he has spent eighteen months in investigation of this question. Now, time does not permit me, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, to indulge in longer debate upon this proposition. I simply refer to this for the purpose of sustaining the assertion with which I started out. I most certainly hope, Mr. Chairman, that this measure will have practically a unanimous passage at the hands of this House and a most worthy service receive its just, honorable, rightful, and equal reward in comparison with other like service rendered the Government. [Loud applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 167. An act for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz;

S. 3437. An act to amend chapter 4, Title XIII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 4339. An act authorizing the White River Railway Company to construct a bridge across the White River, in Arkansas;

S. 4222. An act authorizing the appointment of John Russell Bartlett, a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a rear-admiral on the retired list of the Navy;

S. 3638. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Leffingwell;

S. 1814. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Luke;

S. 4404. An act granting an increase of pension to Otto H. Hasselman;

S. 1107. An act limiting the liability of sureties on bonds of officers of the Navy;

S. 642. An act to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on the public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands;"

S. 1643. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen J. Clark;

S. 4450. An act confirming in the State of South Dakota title to a section of land heretofore granted to said State;

S. 1451. An act to correct the military record of A. W., alias Washington, Huntley;

S. 3797. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver old pieces of ordnance to the Indian war veterans;

S. R. 23. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for a statue of the late Maj. Gen. Alexander Macomb, United States Army;

S. 3821. An act to extend the time for presentation of claims under the act entitled "An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain," approved July 8, 1898, and under acts amendatory thereof;

S. 4572. An act to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to Charles H. Hawley;

S. 3984. An act granting land for a miners' home;

S. 4740. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Godfrey;

S. 4749. An act granting an increase of pension to Eunice A. Smith;

S. 319. An act granting an increase of pension to Ida Warren;  
 S. 3091. An act granting an increase of pension to Matilda R. Schoonmaker;  
 S. 2289. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Harrower;  
 S. 4514. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Beals;  
 S. 3108. An act granting an increase of pension to Inez E. Perrine;  
 S. 4381. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Robinson;  
 S. 2943. An act granting a pension to Thomas S. Rowan;  
 S. 181. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. David;  
 S. 3672. An act granting an increase of pension to James Scannell;  
 S. 3041. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Shilling;  
 S. 4506. An act granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Collier;  
 S. 4792. An act relative to the control of dogs in the District of Columbia;  
 S. 4643. An act granting an increase of pension to Phoebe L. Peyton;  
 S. 3634. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Capehart;  
 S. 4056. An act granting an increase of pension to Minerva Melton;  
 S. 1625. An act granting an increase of pension to Jethro M. Getman, alias James M. Getman;  
 S. 4335. An act granting an increase of pension to John Brown; and  
 S. 1225. An act granting a pension to Clara W. McNair.  
 The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:  
 H. R. 6713. An act granting an increase of pension to Freeman R. E. Chanaberry;  
 H. R. 3418. An act granting a pension to Dennis Dyer;  
 H. R. 11375. An act granting a pension to Charles F. Merrill;  
 H. R. 2124. An act granting an increase of pension to Dewitt C. McCoy;  
 H. R. 6466. An act granting a pension to Josephine M. Dustin;  
 H. R. 6029. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Kelly;  
 H. R. 9301. An act granting an increase of pension to Barbara McDonald;  
 H. R. 11331. An act granting an increase of pension to Abraham N. Bradfield;  
 H. R. 7990. An act granting an increase of pension to Uriah Reams;  
 H. R. 3180. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward S. Dickinson;  
 H. R. 5413. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Van Vliet;  
 H. R. 10193. An act granting an increase of pension to John Hollister;  
 H. R. 1706. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. White;  
 H. R. 10289. An act granting a pension to Eliza Stewart;  
 H. R. 9821. An act granting a pension to John W. Moore;  
 H. R. 2120. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio N. Warren;  
 H. R. 11409. An act to authorize the construction of a traffic bridge across the Savannah River from the mainland within the corporate limits of the city of Savannah to Hutchinsons Island, in the county of Chatham, State of Georgia; and  
 H. R. 9084. An act for the relief of bona fide settlers in forest reserves.

## REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will be obliged if the gentleman from Illinois will now consume the balance of his time, so that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] may have what is remaining on this side to close the debate.

Mr. MANN. I would ask the Chair how much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-eight minutes on the side of the gentleman from Illinois and forty-five minutes on the side of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MANN. Then I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, there may be some similarity in service between the Revenue-Cutter Service and that of the Navy of the United States. So there is between other services that are not regarded as either part of the Navy or part of the Army. There is a transport service of the United States. It is not even in a civil department; it is under the authority of the Secretary of War, and yet I presume that the next move that

will be made in this House will be to attempt to place the officers of the transport service upon the retired list with longevity pay. In fact, I can not see why these officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service should be entitled to those privileges unless you extend it to the transport service. The transport service is conducted by men of experience, and the ships therein are enormous in size compared to those that are in the Revenue-Cutter Service.

Why, Mr. Chairman, when the size of the vessels that are in the Revenue-Cutter Service is known I am astonished that anybody should compare the responsibility of the officers in charge of the same with the responsibility of the naval officers. Upon examination of the list of revenue cutters of the United States I find that the very largest is one of 869 tons capacity and the smallest one of 23 tons capacity. Now, is it possible that gentlemen can seriously compare the responsibility of captains of these vessels with the corresponding officers in charge of the great cruisers and the other great vessels in the Navy of the United States? When we propose to fix the compensation of officers should we not do it with relation to the responsibilities thereof?

Why, Mr. Chairman, to compare this service to the Navy service is simply to compare something that is exceedingly small with something that is very large. The transport service contains vessels that are four, five, and six times as large as those of the Revenue-Cutter Service. I can not see why anyone who would vote for this bill would not also vote for the retirement of the transport captains, and also for the retirement of officers in other services of the Government. This measure is not like one for an appropriation of a certain sum for a completed improvement which, when once made, entails no further obligation upon the Government, but it provides for an appropriation from year to year forever, whether the revenues of the Government are excessive or deficient.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the members of this House and of the country to the enormous increase in the expenditures of this Government within the last forty years. It is appalling to think that such a difference exists between the expenditures of 1860 and those of to-day. I find, upon examination of the statements of the Appropriation Committee, that the total amount of appropriations for the year 1860 was \$82,301,207. Think of it! The appropriations for this entire Government forty years ago—a time within the recollection of a majority of the members of this House—amounted to only \$82,000,000 a year; and yet we find that the appropriations for this fiscal year, ending June 30, 1902, amount to \$730,338,575—almost a ten-fold increase in the expenses of the Government.

The great increase in expenditures has been made only in the past few years, as the appropriations for the fiscal year 1897 was \$469,499,010, while for the year 1900 they were \$674,981,022, and for the year 1901 they were \$710,150,862, an increase of \$250,000,000 a year over what they were prior to the Spanish war.

It is true that population has increased, but not in proportion to the expenditures. I do not say this, Mr. Chairman, to charge that one party or the other is responsible for it. It seems we have some members on this side of the Chamber who are willing to vote for an appropriation whenever the opportunity occurs as well as members upon the other side; but the appalling fact exists that in the last forty years there has been an increase in the expenditures of this Government of nearly 1,000 per cent, while the increase in population has been only 150 per cent. The population of the United States in 1860 was 31,443,321, while in 1900 it was 76,303,387. The tax upon the people in 1860 was only \$2.61 per capita, while now it is \$9.57 for each inhabitant. These figures show that we are going at a breakneck speed in the expenditure of money, and it is time we should call a halt on a bill of this kind, where the parties in the service are better paid than in the corresponding service of private companies.

Mr. Chairman, the very fact that resignations are not frequent in this service shows that these officers appreciate that they are getting as much if not more than they could possibly get in private life. It seems to me that this question ought to be considered by members of this House as if this were a private service of our own. I should like to know how many votes this measure would get in this House if it were a private service of our own. I warrant that not 10 per cent of our votes would be in favor of giving to men over the age of 64 years a pension of \$200 per month while they were rendering no service whatever.

Mr. LESSLER. Would the gentleman mind answering a question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LESSLER. How many members of this House have servants in their employ who go to Alaska and rescue men and devote themselves to trips of that sort?

Mr. SHAFROTH. They may not be in this House, but there are companies that have such men, who venture into all parts of the world, and there is hardly a fraction of 1 per cent that give annuities or life pensions to such employees.



Mr. LESSLER. Do you not know, for instance, that the big railroad companies, whose employees occupy dangerous positions, are establishing pension systems?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think there are only two in the United States, the Illinois Central and the Pennsylvania Railroad. They are the only two that I know of.

Mr. LESSLER. It has got to start somewhere.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be, but it seems to me we are starting on a very high scale—three-fourths pay. If you examine the amounts paid by these companies as pensions they are insignificant. They are simply to keep people from going to the poorhouse. I understand the First National Bank of Chicago has established a similar system; but it makes every man in its service pay 3 per cent a year of his salary to create a fund. Then the fund goes to people who are retired after they reach a certain age. But the very fact that 99 per cent of the people in the commercial world do not carry out this principle shows that we would not do it under like circumstances in our private affairs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, remembering that we are here intrusted with the duty of voting other people's money away, is it possible that we should lavishly give money in every direction? We are acting in the capacity of trustees, and it is our duty to guard the Treasury and the money committed to our hands more zealously than if the money were our own. We all admire a man who becomes liberal and munificent in his gifts to people, because he is spending his own money, but we condemn him when the gifts are from the moneys of his ward. We also know that in cases of trust funds, even if our sympathy is extended, it is our duty absolutely to protect the funds, and in equity if we do not we are chargeable before a court to reimburse the fund out of our own money.

Mr. Chairman, this bill proposes to extend longevity pay to the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service, increasing their salaries 10, 20, 30, and 40 per cent, dependent upon their service of five, ten, fifteen, or twenty years, and to place them on the retired list after they reach the age of 64 years at a salary of \$200 per month.

The pay of a captain who has been in the service twenty years will be \$3,500 per annum and \$576 for commutation of quarters. His compensation now is \$2,500 and \$480 for commutation of quarters, making a total of \$2,980 per annum.

This bill does not provide for an increase of salary or pension for the sailors in the Revenue-Cutter Service, who receive an insignificant sum, but applies only to the officers, who are already receiving more compensation than they could earn in other or like pursuits.

Why should we, after giving men life positions at large salaries, then give them large pensions to retire upon? It seems that it is still true that "To them that have shall be given."

What is the service of these officers? I have not a word of complaint against them. They are probably doing what was given them to do, and doing it well, but when it is pretended that this is a "terrible service," that they are required to work "day and night" month after month, as was stated by the gentleman from New York, it is claiming too much. Ah, Mr. Chairman, that claim is not in accordance with the facts. There happens to be a little record sent by these very officers into the Treasury Department every year of the exact number of days and hours each one of these vessels is at work, and I happen to have the record of these vessels and want to call your attention to it.

I find, Mr. Chairman, that there is one boat—the *Calumet*, at New York—which was at anchor three hundred and twenty-five days, thirteen hours and twenty minutes in the year, and it was sailing, under way, thirty-nine days, ten hours, and forty minutes, and that is "the day and night business for month after month" that gentlemen of this House are trying to make out as such a burden to these men in this service.

Mr. LESSLER. I should like to say to the gentleman that the *Calumet* was up at Chicago and was removed February, 1900. The collector of the port of Chicago, with a petition from the leading merchants of Chicago, asked the Secretary of the Treasury to send her back.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, I can not help that.

Mr. MANN. She was at New York when this report was made.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Now, we come to take another boat, the *Gresham*, at New York. The *Gresham* was 328 days in the year at anchor—328 days 9 hours and 10 minutes—and she was sailing 36 days 14 hours and 50 minutes. These are the gentlemen working day and night at all times. Take another New York boat, the *Hudson*. I find that the *Hudson* was at anchor 320 days 17 hours and 45 minutes during the year, and she was under way only 44 days 6 hours and 15 minutes. We will take the *Manhattan*, that is also stationed at New York.

Mr. LESSLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I can not yield, my time is so limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The *Manhattan* was at anchor 309 days 9 hours and 25 minutes, and she was under way 55 days 15 hours and 35 minutes.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the New York boats; but it is not only at New York. You take the boat at Wilmington, for instance. There is a boat that was at anchor 312 days out of the year. You take the boat at Boston, the *Chandler*. It was at anchor 339 days and 3 hours out of the year; and out of the list which is here collected there is not a single boat, not a single one of these vessels, but was at anchor 300 days in the year, and the number of sailing days was less than 65.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen, perhaps, did not have any orders that required them to do more work, and it was all right. I do not pretend to say but what they performed their duty well, and I do not mean to say that the officers are not good officers; but when men get up in this House and say that their service is exceedingly hard, and that they work day and night, month after month, that they go out at all hours, and that this service ought to be remunerated even more than the Navy, as one gentleman has said, it seems to me that these facts will not warrant such assertions.

This service of course is needed. It is a service that properly has been classed in the United States as a civil service. Since the foundation of the Government it has not been in the War Department nor in the Navy Department, but has been connected with the Treasury Department, and its very name—the Revenue-Cutter Service—indicates where it properly belongs. It is in the civil list at the present time, and there is no provision in this bill which transfers it to the Navy Department.

Now, when we extend the longevity pay, make a pension of \$200 a month for this retired list, and justify it by claiming the service is something like that of the Navy, are we not putting ourselves in a condition that when this bill is passed nearly every other service of the Government will say, "Why, the Revenue-Cutter Service is surely a civil service; it is not in the Navy Department. You have already broken over the line in the one case, why can you not do it in ours?" The Life-Saving Service will then present their claims. It is a service that is a great deal more in need of an increase pay and of retirement pension than this service. Therefore I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will be defeated. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate the feebleness of anything I may say in reference to this bill, especially as I know that I will be followed on the floor by the ablest orator and debater in the House, for whose judgment I have great respect and for whose ability I acknowledge that I am unworthy even to unloosen the latches of his shoes.

I warn the House against being carried away by the eloquence of appeal to be made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

It has been with diffidence that I have even advanced any views which I had upon this bill. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I may say that had I known a few days ago that I would meet the displeasure of the distinguished "constitutional expounder" of the law, I should have acknowledged my defeat and not made any speech or argument on the proposition at all. I am perfectly well aware that after the House has listened to the exposition by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] there remains nothing in the way of argument or facts to be submitted to the House. It is true that he has not devoted a year and a half of time, as he said I had, to the bill, but it is also true that with that wonderful eloquence and commanding brain of his, he only needs over night to glance at a subject to be familiar with its utmost details. [Laughter.]

A few days ago the gentleman was running from desk to desk in the House submitting an amendment to the bill which this morning he declares the bill was perfect without. The attitude of the gentleman from Maine, and my own attitude upon this bill reminds me of a story which my boy sometimes repeats: When the ark was landed on Mount Ararat and the animals under the supervision of Noah were leaving the ark, with all kinds of animals moving out of that vessel, the ant and the elephant happened to be passing out at the same time. And the great elephant from Maine said to the ant from Illinois, "Who are you a shoving off?" I am sorry that I have caused any disturbance in the masterful mind of the brilliant and eloquent gentleman who has expounded all constitutional questions upon this subject, as he has before upon the subject of the Porto Rico tariff and upon the seating of a Mormon from Utah. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, there are practically two propositions in the bill pending, and the whole solution of this question depends upon, I believe, in the opinion of the House, whether this bill shall be considered as commencing a civil pension list or whether it shall be considered as giving a pension list to men now in the military service of the Government. I have heard it stated three or four



times by the advocates of this bill upon the floor of the House that the Revenue-Cutter Service was the first to fire a gun in the recent Spanish war. This statement, like many others upon the subject, is misleading and an error. The Revenue-Cutter Service did not fire the first gun at Manila. The first gun fired at Manila was fired through the negligence of the Revenue-Cutter Service.

When Dewey and his fleet were passing up the inlet to get into Manila Bay, with lights all concealed and the effort made to steal up without giving notice to the enemy of the approach, it was the revenue cutter there, the *McCulloch*, which gave notice to the enemy by permitting her smokestack to burn out. The revenue cutter *McCulloch* was in line, but the revenue cutter did not fire the first gun in the battle, if the revenue cutter's captain himself can be believed, whose report is printed in a report favoring this bill.

But I would not detract from the gallantry of these officers there. I have no doubt that the officers of the revenue cutter *McCulloch* at Manila were anxious to get into the fight. But they were not permitted to go into the fight; they were not in the battle at Manila Bay. They were kept on the outside as a dispatch boat, or an auxiliary boat.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the effort is made to show that in time of peace the Revenue-Cutter Service is one of great danger. This belief was exploited yesterday by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BELLAMY], who said:

During the four months I have designated—December, January, February, and March—when it is sleeting and raining and freezing, these people are not even permitted to go into port except when necessary to make a report or to supply the ship with exhausted provisions or coal.

The gentleman from North Carolina stated that I had not been on a Revenue-Cutter vessel. He probably did not know whether I had or not. But whether I had or not has nothing to do with the question. The gentleman from North Carolina pretends to have great information concerning the doings of the Revenue-Cutter vessel located at his city, the city of Wilmington, N. C.; and he stated on the floor that this vessel was not permitted to go into port except when necessary to make a report or obtain supplies.

Now, I have here the report of the revenue cutter *Algonquin*, which is situated at Wilmington, N. C., and which is the vessel about which the gentleman was talking. This vessel, which, as the gentleman from North Carolina says, is not permitted to go into port except for the purpose of making a report or for supplies, has a record as to what it was doing during the months of December, January, February, and March. That record is on file in the office in the Treasury building, and I have here a compilation of what it shows. It seems that during December, 1900, this revenue cutter, which, according to the gentleman, is not permitted to go into port, had its anchor weighed three days and twenty hours; during January, 1901, it had its anchor weighed for a total of three days seventeen hours and twenty-five minutes; during the month of February, 1901, it had its anchor weighed for a total of four days five hours and five minutes; during the month of March it had its anchor weighed three days fifteen hours and twenty minutes. During the four months of which the gentleman speaks it had its anchor weighed not exceeding sixteen days.

Mr. BELLAMY. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. BELLAMY. If the gentleman had referred to the RECORD of this morning, he would have seen that the instruction of which I spoke was issued November 26, 1901, so that the period of four months of which I spoke was December, 1901, and January, February, and March, 1902. If the gentleman has the record there, I ask him to read it.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have not the record for the last month or for this winter. But the gentleman stated that from his knowledge the *Algonquin* was performing the same duties a year ago that it has been performing this last winter. I asked him the question, and he said he knew it was so. During the winter before last this vessel during a term of four months was in service on the seas for a total of time expressed in days of sixteen days. That was the time when, according to the distinguished gentleman, this vessel was not permitted to go into port except to report or to obtain supplies.

And that is not all. There is no vessel of the Revenue-Cutter Service which is occupied more than one-fourth of her time, if that much, in sailing on the seas or elsewhere. More than three-fourths of the time all of these vessels are at anchor. But, more than that, the whole claim made here in behalf of the Revenue-Cutter Service is that it is doing arduous duty and dangerous duty, succoring vessels or shipwrecked sailors upon the seas. Yet the very letter of instructions, which the gentleman from North Carolina has put in the RECORD, directs the Revenue-Cutter officers not to remain at sea in a gale or in a fog. The direction to the Revenue-Cutter officer is to go into port when the weather is foggy or when there is a gale.

But we have a record of all the vessels which this service has assisted. When this bill was before the House a year ago, I inserted in the RECORD a copy of the reports of the assistance rendered by the revenue cutters in 1897, which was the last report issued by this Department and printed.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Has the gentleman any statistics showing the length of time during the last year that the battle ships of the United States were at anchor?

Mr. MANN. I have not. But I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the solution of this question is not dependent upon the Navy. If there are abuses in the Navy they can be corrected in the proper way. The proper way is not by passing a bill to increase the abuses in another branch of the service.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he had put in the RECORD a list giving the service of all these cutters?

Mr. MANN. I did not so state.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Excuse me; I did not quite get your statement. Will you please repeat it?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has examined what I put in the RECORD, and his question is futile and idle.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The gentleman will excuse me—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is taking up my time excusing himself.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I understood you to say that you were going to place in the RECORD some additional reports.

Mr. MANN. I would be glad to place in the RECORD everything which the Revenue-Cutter Service has done, and I dare the gentleman to put in the RECORD, as a representative of the Revenue-Cutter Service interests, what duty it has performed during the past year. Although this bill was before Congress a year ago, although the same opposition was then made, they have not dared to publish the report of their doings. Now, it is manifestly impossible for one member of the House to obtain all this information, but I have obtained some information in reference to this, which I inserted in the RECORD a few days ago.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Will the gentleman excuse me?

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not detain me too much.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will hand you the report of the *Woodbury* for last year if you would like it. Do you care for it?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will leave it here, if I have time to examine it I will. The gentleman is endeavoring to take a very unfair advantage.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Excuse me; I am not.

Mr. MANN. With that eminent fairness which always characterizes him of trying to get a gentleman on the floor with his time limited to read something which he holds in his hand! Why did not the gentleman, if he wanted to show fairness, submit the paper to me before, and I would have examined it when I had time?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Well, I shall not bother you with it now.

Mr. MANN. Oh, you will not bother me with it at all. [Laughter.] It is impossible for the gentleman to bother me with it, notwithstanding his elephantine intellect. Now, Mr. Chairman, the report of the committee in favor of this bill states that this Revenue-Cutter Service assisted vessels last year which, with their cargoes—I do not want the gentleman from Maine to think that I am personal in any way—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Oh, that is all right. I am perfectly willing to have you personal, if you desire to be. I have not the slightest objection.

Mr. MANN. The report of the committee on this bill states that the Revenue-Cutter Service assisted vessels last year which, with their cargoes, amounted to a total of \$5,125,000, and it is the intention of this report to show that the Revenue-Cutter Service was valuable, because it saved property to the value of \$5,125,000. Now, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BELLAMY] says that his vessel, the *Algonquin*, is out cruising all the time, in sleet and rain and freezing weather, for the purpose of rescuing distressed vessels. I have in the RECORD a compilation, not selected because they were favorable to my side of the question, but I selected all cases where the value of the vessel and cargo amounted to as much as \$75,000, and I have shown in the RECORD out of the \$5,000,000, which they claim was saved, the entire circumstances relating to about four and a half million dollars.

The only case where the vessel from Wilmington, the *Algonquin*, represented by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BELLAMY] appears is in the rescue or assistance rendered to the vessel *Star Cross* on June 29 and 30, 1901. The captain reports: "Light-house in plain sight; sea smooth." There was no difficulty, no sleet, no rain, no freezing weather. The only case occurred in June, with a smooth sea, and then the vessel helped some tugs or wrecking vessels to pull a vessel off where it had struck the shore or struck bottom. I wish to call the attention of the House and I ask the gentlemen, if they wish to take the



trouble to examine each one of these cases—I call attention to the fact that there is not a single one where the Revenue-Cutter Service incurred any danger; not one. There are but few cases. The first case they report on the condition of the weather and tide: "State of tide and sea: Smooth sea; gentle, southerly swell."

What danger they were undergoing! The next case they report, "Smooth sea." The next case occurred in a harbor, where the sea could not be other than smooth. The next case occurred within a harbor, and consisted only in sending some men on shore to arrest a man whom they claimed had mutinied. The next case, "State of tide and sea: Flood tide, smooth sea." The next case occurred in San Francisco Harbor, where the sea was smooth. The next case occurred in the Yukon River, where the sea was smooth, and this case that I have referred to now is but a sample of the assistance rendered by the Revenue-Cutter Service, so far as assisting vessels is concerned, and I propose—it is very short—to read to the House the detailed statement of the casualty, showing the nature and extent of service rendered by the revenue cutter in that instance:

Vessel assisting, *Nunivak*.  
Vessel assisted, steamer *Leon*.  
Date, June 22, 1901.  
Value of vessel with cargo, \$2,600,000.

Here is one-half of the property that was saved in the year, and you would suppose from the report that this was saved by arduous labor and at the risk of life on the part of the Revenue Cutter officers and men.

Detailed report: Arriving at Aphoon, mouth of Yukon River, June 22, 1901, found steamer *Leon* short of provisions for passengers and crew, she having been detained here a week by ice and her supplies exhausted. No prospect of ice clearing up for several days. None of the other vessels could assist her, as they, too, were running short, and no supplies within reach on the river. Loaned her from ship's rations 800 pounds flour, 50 pounds coffee, 72 pounds butter, to be replaced in kind at St. Michael.

Now, I grant that it was a desirable thing that the revenue cutter there should loan these provisions to this vessel *Leon*. I do not criticize them for what they did, but I insist that there was no arduous duty, no danger, no risk of life in loaning 800 pounds of flour to a vessel, and when they claim that they saved valuable property or assisted a vessel, the value of which amounted to \$2,600,000, it is utterly misleading.

The next report was in the Yukon River also, where they loaned in that case 200 pounds of flour, and take credit for saving property to the value of \$75,000. There is not a single case in these reports, which are taken from the head of the list, embracing \$4,500,000 out of the \$5,000,000—there is not a single case where a rowboat could have been turned over by the waves of the sea.

Oh, yes; valuable service! I do not believe that anybody can find out what the Revenue-Cutter Service actually does, outside of boarding vessels and examining their papers. It seems to me that they do not show any arduous labor in time of peace which entitles them to be placed on the pension roll.

As many men have been killed in a year—during the last fiscal year—in the Railway Mail Service in the discharge of their duties as have been killed in the Revenue-Cutter Service during forty years of time. More men are killed in the Life-Saving Service in a year than have been killed in the Revenue-Cutter Service in forty years' time. As many men lost their lives in the Life-Saving Service a few days ago as have been killed in the Revenue-Cutter Service in forty years of time. More men lost their lives in the Railway Mail Service in a wreck down here a few days ago than have lost their lives in the Revenue-Cutter Service in forty years' time. I do not say that that is any reflection upon the Revenue-Cutter Service. Far from it. They have no occasion to come into great danger.

But, oh, they say, in time of war! Mr. Chairman, the Revenue-Cutter Service is not a fighting force in time of war. It is simply a dispatch service. It is not on the firing line in time of war.

Mr. MAHON. They can be sent there at any time.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; they could be sent there, but they are not sent there. They do not receive injury. Why, here is a case, probably, of great gallantry at Cardenas, when Ensign Bagley and those on his naval vessel were being shot to pieces, when half of the men on the naval vessel were killed; it is true that a revenue cutter, the *Hudson*, pulled the naval vessel away. It is true also that half the men on the naval vessel were killed, and that no man had his skin scratched on the revenue cutter.

Mr. MAHON. They must have been pretty close when they pulled the boat off.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania would suggest that it may have been an accident. It is a peculiar accident that not an officer has been injured in the Revenue-Cutter Service in time of war for many years.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. How many men were killed in the naval battle at Santiago?

Mr. MANN. I believe one only, but a number were injured, and no revenue cutter was in the fight.

Mr. MAHON. How many at Manila?

Mr. MANN. There were several injured there, I think, and I believe there was one killed. One died of apoplexy. But no revenue cutter was in the fight at Manila.

Mr. MAHON. The first boat that went in was a revenue cutter.

Mr. MANN. That shows that the gentleman is not informed as to history. I have not time to argue about facts of history.

Mr. MAHON. A revenue cutter went in to look for the torpedoes.

Mr. MANN. The first boat that went into Manila was not a revenue cutter.

Mr. MAHON. The *McCulloch*.

Mr. MANN. It was not the *McCulloch*. The Revenue-Cutter Service is not a fighting force in time of war. But, Mr. Chairman, if it were, its officers would be no more than the volunteers. The State which I represent in part had more than 800 men in the Navy as volunteers during the Spanish war. They are not put upon the retired list. They went into the Navy, losing their positions and salaries at home. They are not asking to be placed upon the retired list. They were in the fighting ships; they were not on dispatch boats; and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania and others have constituents who were in the Navy, fighting in the Spanish war, and they are not asking to be put upon the retired list, and if they were the request would not be granted.

Mr. MAHON. Some of them have been put on the pension roll.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but nobody has been put on the pension roll on account of being injured in the Revenue-Cutter Service. There was no officer injured during this Spanish war, injured in the service. There were two who died from apoplexy, but none were injured, and if injured they would have been entitled to pension.

Now, Congress has since recognized anything which the Revenue-Cutter Service did during the war with Spain. They retired the captain of the *McCulloch* at full captain's pay. They gave a gold medal for the gallantry displayed by Lieutenant Newcomb at Cardenas. And now the other officers of that service are here endeavoring unjustly and unfairly to fatten on the deeds of those two men. A letter has been read by this distinguished son of Maine from the Secretary of the Navy.

This letter says that this service ought to be put under the Navy. I agree with that. I believe it ought to be a part of the Navy. It absolutely has nothing to do at present. I would be willing to transfer this service—men, officers, and vessels—to the Navy, where it might be made a part of a system. But here is a bureau intended to be a new navy of itself; and when Secretary Long says in the letter read that this is the first step toward putting it in the Navy I beg to disagree with him. If this bill passes, the Revenue-Cutter Service will for all time remain by itself, enlarging its force, increasing its number of vessels and its officers, but it will never go to the Navy. It will, on the other hand, be a handle for the passage of a civil pension list for every branch of the service.

Why, gentlemen, we have to meet that question soon. There is a committee in Washington engaged here for some time preparing a bill for introduction in this Congress to put a retired list into every branch of the public service. It claims that they have responses from more than 20,000 Government employees. Now, I put it to you fairly. You know very well that if this bill passes it passes because of the insistence here of the men and officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service itself. If Congress can not resist 215 Revenue-Cutter officers, what chance is there to resist 20,000 or more employees of the Government? There is no man in this House but has Government employees in his district. I do not say that a retired list is improper. I have been inclined to the opinion that a proper retired list or a civil pension list might be a good thing. I think that every man who loses his life or is injured in the Life-Saving Service or in the Railway Mail Service ought to be covered by the pension list.

I am not sure but what the old men in the Treasury ought to be put on the retired list. But I would never propose a civil pension list that begins with \$200 a month, as this does. Here is a proposition commencing a civil-service pension list at \$200 a month. If we can not draw the line between the Navy and the Revenue-Cutter Service, how will it be possible to draw the line between the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Life-Saving Service? How will it be possible to draw the line between the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Railway Mail Service? There is such small gradation or degrees of gradation between the different services of the Government that once you place one branch of the service on a pension list you will have commenced that which must end with all branches of the service. I appeal to this House to be careful before it commences a civil pension list. There is no end; when you open the door it is open for all the employees of the Government for all time. [Loud applause.]



Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire if the time of the opponents of the bill has been entirely exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. It has.

Mr. HEPBURN. How much remains?

The CHAIRMAN. Forty-five minutes remains to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois upon the condition of mind when he is prepared to express disapprobation because a larger number of American citizens have not been slaughtered in war. It is an unhappy frame of mind, I would suggest to the gentleman, if I was permitted; and I am glad to believe that there are but few of his colleagues that sympathize with him in the expressions that he has made in that part of his speech.

We have wandered a long way, Mr. Chairman, from the real questions presented in this bill. We have a service known as the Revenue-Cutter Service. It consists of a little more than 200 officers, and something more than 1,100 enlisted men, of about 40 vessels armed with seventy-odd guns. These vessels with their armament, modern in character, fully up to date, presents an infinitely more formidable naval force than the Government of the United States had at the date of 1835. There never was a time up to that date—in war or peace—when the naval power of the United States was so formidable as is this much contemned and sneered service—the Revenue-Cutter Service.

The propositions of this bill are mainly to place the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service more nearly upon a par with the other branch of the maritime naval service. It proposes to do so by the reviving of an old law relating to the relative rank of the officers of the two services, made necessary in part because of a change in the name of certain of the naval officers, and with the addition of one grade to the Revenue-Cutter Service since that enactment was made.

It next provides for the retirement of these officers on a par with the officers of the Army, not with the officers of the Navy. There is a distinction and a broad one, and the Revenue-Cutter officers and their friends have not asked that the more valuable retirement provision of the Navy should be made applicable to them. These officers, if retired, will be retired in the grade in which they served at the time of retirement. Not so with the naval officer. He is retired in a grade above that that he holds at the date of his retirement, and he has the pay and emoluments of that higher grade.

Again, officers of the Navy may be retired at least four grades—captains, commanders, lieutenant-commanders, and certain lieutenants may be at any time retired, not after thirty years of service, not after forty years of service, not after they have arrived at the age of 64, but at any time. Under the provisions of an act that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] voted for only a little while ago they may be retired. Again, an officer of the Navy may be retired although the cause of disability has had no relation whatever to his service, and although it may be the result of his own vicious habits. Not so with the Army or with the retirement that is proposed to be given to these officers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what are some of the objections made to this bill? The first fifteen minutes occupied by the opponents of it—by the gentleman from Illinois—were devoted to this complaint: The bill ought not even to be considered, because the Revenue-Cutter Service have not made that character of report that the act of 1898 required them to make. The act of 1898 requires no report from any officer of the Revenue-Cutter Service. It requires a report of expenditures from the Secretary of the Treasury. The gentleman knew why that was not made. He had the information why its failure had occurred. He had it at the time that he made that complaint and this charge of criminality against the Revenue-Cutter Service. He said that it was because they dared not make that report; because they were afraid to make it. He had, from the Secretary of the Treasury, a letter stating why it was not made and explaining why the error occurred—a true statement, that evinced no dereliction of duty, a mere mistake, and yet it was such a one as passed the scrutiny of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, not friendly to this bill, who went on making the appropriations just as though it had been made, with all the information that was needed.

The gentleman from Illinois was unwilling to support this bill because he had not information. Your attention has been called to the year and a half that he expended in this vain search for knowledge, and yet he knows, and I know, because he was compelled by his own sense of fairness ultimately to acknowledge it, that all the information possessed by anyone was laid before him and that he was furnished by an intelligent clerk with the books of the Department, with every facility for acquiring all of the knowledge that he could want with regard to an intelligent understanding of the relation of this body of men to the Government of the United States. The Secretary says that he was misled by a marginal note on the page opposite the section requiring this report; that he understood that it was a detailed statement of estimates that was to be made. That is all there is in that.

The gentleman then found fault, and seriously insisted that this bill ought not to pass, because there was not a list of the employees of the Revenue-Cutter Service on the Blue Book. He regarded that as an offense that they had omitted to put their names there, notwithstanding that most American citizens are glad to have their names there, and rather, I am informed, seek the opportunity. But when we come to investigate we find that the names are there. Everyone connected with the Revenue-Cutter Service is found where it should be, under its appropriate head, on that Blue Book. That ought to remove the gentleman's second objection.

The third one that was urged is, and that one was more strenuously urged by the gentleman from Tennessee, that this is to establish a civil pension list. That depends, Mr. Chairman, upon the relation that this service bears to the General Government. Is it civil in its character or is it military? The gentleman from Pikes Peak, perched pleasantly upon the summit of that vast mountain, taking in that comprehensive view that from that point he may survey the military and naval establishment of the United States, does not hesitate to say that it is civil. [Laughter.] Then my friend from Tennessee, from his home by the side of that magnificent spring in Huntsville, so wonderfully adapted to nautical pursuits [laughter]—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to lose my identity entirely. The gentleman ought to know that I am from Alabama.

Mr. HEPBURN. I intended to compliment the gentleman first, but now since my attention is called to it I will compliment the State of Alabama by making the correction. [Applause.] The gentleman from that beautiful spring so adapted to nautical pursuits has determined that this is a civil service, that there is nothing military about it; and both of the gentlemen in furtherance of their arguments have said that one of the reasons why they came to that conclusion was that the Revenue-Cutter Service never fought except in time of war. [Laughter.] Why, my God, my friends, when would you have them fight? [Laughter.] Do you want them so organized as is my friend from Illinois, who is ready to fight all the time and everything? [Laughter.] When I have observed that peculiarity upon the part of my friend from Illinois I have thought that if the theory of transmigration of souls is true and he hereafter appeared as a later incarnation, he would have the semblance of a mule with four hind legs all in active operation. [Great laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen fight only when the other soldiery of the United States fight. And in time of peace they are put to other duties.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will my friend—

Mr. HEPBURN. I would rather the gentleman from Tennessee would not interrupt me.

Several MEMBERS. Alabama! [Laughter.]

Mr. HEPBURN. My apologies all around are duplicated. Without disparagement of our naval establishment, in which we all take pride and for which we are all willing to do all that may be necessary to make it reach up to the highest standard of completeness, what do they do in times of peace? The objection which these hypercritical gentlemen make with regard to the Revenue-Cutter Service being pacific in times of peace can be made against the naval establishment much more forcibly. After hearing these authorities, the gentleman from Colorado, and the gentleman from Alabama, and the gentleman from Illinois, who know nothing about the subject, vociferating so earnestly that these Revenue-Cutter officers are a civic body, I would like to call attention for a moment to the opinion of a man who knows something about the subject. I read from a report of a Secretary of the Navy—not of the Treasury, but of the Navy:

The service of the cruising cutters is strictly naval.

Will the gentleman from Colorado listen to that?

The duties of the officers are not distinguishable in kind from those of the naval officers.

Will the gentleman from Alabama note that?

The discipline is naval, as far as naval discipline can be carried on outside of the Naval Department. The cruising cutters carry armaments of from one to four guns. The crews are armed with small arms. Broadside guns are furnished by the Navy Department. In time of war these vessels have always been pressed into the naval service.

Will the gentleman from Illinois note that? This is from one of the most distinguished of all the naval secretaries, in my judgment, that we have ever had; a man to whose efforts we owe largely the Navy we have to-day; a man whose influence, more than that of any other living man, has made our naval establishment the splendid feature that it is of our civilization.

A MEMBER. Who was he?

Mr. HEPBURN. That was Secretary Chandler. I now read from the report of another Secretary of the Navy:

Now, as I understand, the objections of officers of the Navy to this bill—

A bill largely similar to this—

they have come to be practically merely sentimental. In the first place, they



say it is not a military service. My answer to that is that whether it is a military service or not depends entirely or very largely on the officer who commands the ship. It is certainly a military force. It has commanding officers, inferior officers, and men—privates who are subordinate. It is organized; its organization is a military organization.

Why, sir, at the very beginning of the career of the cadets they take a military examination. So far as the studies are concerned, before they enter the service they must have those attainments that will entitle them to the prospects of success. Throughout their whole two years at school the studies are of that character. The higher mathematics—all that pertains to drill—everything that they study is in its nature fit for military training and military service.

Every one of these vessels of later construction is armed. Every day there is a military drill of the crews. They are drilled in the use of the cutlass, the use of the revolver, the use of the carbine, the use of the broadside. It is all military, and they have been able to show with what alacrity they can assume the sterner duties of war.

I was sorry to hear my friend from Illinois attempt to belittle the service of these men. It is not so comprehensive, it has not been so broad a school, as are the performances of the Army or the Navy. Why? Because of the limitations of the number of men and of ships. But everywhere where they have had opportunity they have reached up to the full measure of valor that is expected of American soldiery.

Reference has been made to the affair at Cardenas, and sneeringly to the part performed by the Revenue-Cutter Service on that occasion. What was that? Three vessels were sent in shoreward for a purpose. They came within the range of powerful masked batteries. One of the vessels was disabled. Her commander was either wounded or killed. The next officer in command was disabled. More than half of her crew were weltering on her decks in their own blood. She was in the extremest peril, drifting inward toward the battery and on to the shoals.

There was another naval vessel with her. The little flotilla consisted of two naval vessels and one revenue cutter. I have no criticism to make upon the conduct of one of those naval vessels, yet when the time of trial came, when the time of rescue came it was the *Hudson*, the revenue cutter, that responded, while the others sought safety at sea. [Applause.] And there, as the Secretary of the Navy tells the story, for more than an hour, in the very vortex of that terrible fire, this vessel labored to secure a hawser to the naval vessel, in order to carry her out, and after securing it the hawser parted, and again the labor had to be undergone, and for an hour this condemned revenue cutter stood there at her post, every man doing his duty, and finally she brought to safety the naval officers and men. [Loud applause.]

I say that in all the records of the last war, in all the naval stories that I have ever read, there is not one to be found where more of heroism was exhibited than by these officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service; and, Mr. Chairman, on all occasions wherever they have been called upon, they have met the full measure of duty.

Now, the studies of all the officers are military. Military tactics are taught them and they have a daily military drill. They wear the uniform of the Navy. Their ships are armed as are naval vessels. They have all the skill that the naval vessels have, and on all occasions when the Navy is engaged in war, they are engaged in war, and yet gentlemen set up the pretense that this is a civil employment, and that these men are civil officers.

Mr. Chairman, it stands to reason that these officers, man for man, are more valuable than are the naval officers. I do not hesitate to make that assertion. They spring from the same source; they are our American boys; they have the same culture, except in perhaps some of those things that many of us would say were not necessary to fit them for purely military duty. They have the same drill, the same instruction as soldiers; they are familiar with the same kind of weapons. They have all of the experience that the others have in times of war, and then they are kept upon the sea, the gentleman from Illinois to the contrary notwithstanding. The naval officer has his tour of sea duty and then a like period on shore. These men are always upon the sea, they are always upon the sea when seamanship is most needed, and when opportunities are ripest for seamanship to be acquired.

It is when the storm comes, I say; when there is danger along the coast, I say; when the naval vessel seeks the security of the port if she can, that these men go out to rescue life and to render assistance. It is in the storm that they are bred and that they study their seamanship; and so I say that, man for man, in my judgment, when the officer has reached the age of 40 or 45, all of the probabilities are in favor of the Revenue-Cutter officer being the better, the more experienced, the wiser, and the safer navigator and commander of his ship. I do not think that it ought to be contended that this is a civil service. Gentlemen have said that the title of this bill is deceptive; that it is said to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, while there was

nothing to be found in its provisions except provisions promoting the interests of certain of the membership of that service.

Mr. Chairman, there are to-day 14 officers who have served long and faithfully in this service who have reached the age that brings incapacity, or who are suffering now from the vicissitudes of service to that degree that they can not perform their duties. They can not be retired. We are in the condition that twice before has confronted the Congress. Some eight or ten years ago, or perhaps a little longer, it was found that there were nearly 20 of these officers, all filling the highest ranks, that were incapable of service. One of them, I remember, was then 84 years of age. Several of them had passed the age of 70. Yet there was no method by which they could be replaced, and so an act was passed limited to them, however, that authorized their retirement. Four, five, or six years ago the same condition was found to exist, and again an act was passed so that perhaps 15 more were retired, and now there are 23 men, I think, on this retired list.

There are fourteen or sixteen who are to-day in the condition that their comrades were at the period of this legislation. Will it not promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service to relieve it of those incapacitated men? Will it not promote the service to give promotion to those that remain, to let them see that there is some hope of advancement in the service of their choice? Does not the doing of justice to one stimulate a little more, a good deal, perhaps, to more efficient service, to more of zeal. We are apt to take deeper interest in those who have an interest in us and manifest it by good deeds than those who do not, and these men would only be human if some such thought sometimes crossed their minds, so I can see that there is in this bill provision for promoting the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and that the bill is not deceptive and that it ought to pass.

I have taken the liberty of reading the opinions of some gentlemen whose opinions were worth while. As early as 1872 Mr. Boutwell, then the Secretary of the Treasury, advocated the passage of a somewhat similar bill to this. In 1873 Secretary Richardson recommended the same. In 1876 Secretary Morrill made a somewhat lengthy report and argument in favor of the passage of a relief measure of this kind. In 1881 Mr. Folger made the same recommendation; and right here I would like to put the opinion of a Secretary of the Treasury whose duty it was to know against the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois on this subject:

In view of the constant activity required of them in time of peace as well as war and of the hazard involved in their service—

Will the gentleman please note the words I have taken the liberty to emphasize?—

activity and hazard involved in their service, their cruising being mostly upon the shallow waters and dangerous courses near the coast, subjecting them during the inclement winter season to extreme hardship and danger, their claim to pensions seems to be well founded.

Ah, how these adroit and cunning fellows of the service have pulled the wool over the eyes of the Secretaries, and how grateful some benighted Secretary will be to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for having devoted his eighteen months to unearthing all these frauds and bringing these reptiles of the sea into full view!

But again, Mr. Folger, not content with his argument in 1881, repeated what he had to say in 1882, and then in 1894 Mr. Carlisle had something to say on the subject. I do not know whether that distinguished gentleman is an authority upon the other side of the House now or not, but he discussed this subject. He devoted considerable time to it, occupying more than a page in his report, in which he used this language:

There is no branch of the public service which in time of peace requires such continuous, laborious, and hazardous service as this, nor is there any other branch in which the compensation is so inadequate. The duties imposed upon the officers engaged in this service often subject them to great exposure and hardship, and require the exercise of a high order of skill and discretion, and it is therefore of the first importance that the mental and physical qualifications of the force should not be impaired by the retention of old, infirm, or otherwise disabled officers.

Well, my Democratic brethren, listen to that! This ought to be good authority.

Mr. Chairman, if I can not succeed in attracting the attention of members on the other side to the utterances of John G. Carlisle, I wish you would try and keep order. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. Gentlemen standing in the aisles will kindly take their seats.

Mr. HEPBURN. Again, in 1896, Mr. Carlisle called attention to this branch of the public service.

Mr. Gage, in 1897, called the attention of Congress to a bill substantially similar to this in his report, occupying more than a page of that report. Again, in 1898, and again, in 1899, he devotes two pages to the subject. Again, in the report of 1900, he devotes a page and a half to it, and again, in 1901, most earnestly calls the attention of Congress to the subject.

Two Presidents of the United States have urged upon Congress the performance of this duty. President McKinley especially challenged the attention of this body and the other to the report of the Secretary, and indorsed the arguments that he made,

reiterating his recommendation and doing all that he could to challenge attention to the subject.

Gentlemen, it is and has been a vexed question. It is a justice that has been long delayed. Yet I take it it is none the less just because we have failed to respond to this demand of duty. I have no hesitation in affirming that these men are entitled to this tardy justice, that they are entitled to it now, and that the measure of justice we propose to mete out to them is that which this House has meted out to others situated as they are with no more of demand, with no more of the pleadings of justice in their behalf. I think that we owe it to our old comrades. There are today in the naval service of the United States, I am told, ten veterans who served in naval warfare during the war of the rebellion. All ten of those men are to-day rear-admirals in the Navy of the United States.

There are 30 men or more now in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, no one of them ranking higher than a captain, and not more than four or five drawing half the pay of the admirals. The one survivor of that most memorable of naval battles that took place in Hampton Roads in 1862 between the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* is now in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States. His comrade died only a little while ago, and was one of those survivors who stood by the side of Worden, directing the movements of his ship when he received his disabling wound, the one for all these years a rear-admiral, the other simply a lieutenant and captain in the Cutter Service.

Gentlemen, it is unworthy of the American Congress, and I ask you now to right the wrong so long permitted, to bring about that justice so long delayed, by passing this most meritorious and just bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time fixed by the order of the House for general debate having expired, the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill by paragraphs for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That on and after the passage of this act the commissioned officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service shall be as follows: Captains, first lieutenants, second lieutenants, third lieutenants, captain of engineers, chief engineers, first assistant engineers, second assistant engineers, and constructor; and the captain of engineers, chief engineers, first assistant engineers, second assistant engineers shall have the rank of captain, first, second, and third lieutenants, respectively; and the constructor shall have the rank of first lieutenant.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1, after the word "lieutenant," in line 11, by adding the following: "Provided, however, That there shall be no increase in the number of officers upon the active list over the present number in each class or grade."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HEPBURN. I think there is no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to discuss the amendment?

Mr. MANN. I do not care to discuss it.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will vote with you for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all of section 1 after the enacting clause.

Mr. HEPBURN. I raise the point of order against that motion, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HEPBURN. That would leave the bill in an entirely incomplete form. The motion to strike out all after the enacting clause must be an entirety—the bill—and not a single section of the bill. That is one of the methods of terminating the consideration of a bill, one of the parliamentary methods, to strike out all after the enacting clause. That ends the measure; and the motion is used only for that purpose.

Mr. MANN. My motion was to strike out all after the enacting clause.

Mr. HEPBURN. I know; and that does not subserve that parliamentary purpose.

Mr. MANN. That does not subserve that parliamentary purpose and is not intended to subserve that parliamentary purpose. Does the Chairman wish to hear me further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. A motion to strike out the enacting clause under the rules and practice of the House is, if adopted, fatal to the bill. It is expressly declared in Rule XXIII, section 7, that such a motion, if carried, shall be considered equivalent to the rejection of the bill. The proposed amendment, however, is to strike out not the enacting clause, but that portion of the section or paragraph following the enacting clause. What effect the striking out of that part of the paragraph will have upon the bill is for the committee, and not for the Chair, to determine. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not see why this section is

put in the bill. There is no change, as I understand, made as to the number of Revenue-Cutter officers in section 1. It does not destroy the harmony of the bill at all if it is stricken out. It simply, so far as I can see, reenacts the existing law, which now provides who Revenue-Cutter officers shall be. Now, here is a section, and I invite the attention of gentlemen to the fact, the only change and the only purpose of any change in this section is to enact the present law, is to take the engineers out of the engineer force and make them line officers.

Now, I have no objection to that in one respect. I voted for the naval personnel bill in the House, supposing that that was the only thing in the bill. My information is, and whether it is correct or not I do not know, that that bill has not been a good thing for the Navy; and if this section is enacted into law as to the Revenue-Cutter Service of the country it simply means that the warrant machinists and the machinists do all the engineer work and the engineer officers on a line with the other officers attend to the duties of the other officers. If there is any need of engineer officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service, and I take it there is, then we ought to leave these engineer officers.

There is no use, unless it is a purely social distinction, in saying that the chief engineer shall have a certain rank with the other officers, that the chief engineer shall have rank as first lieutenant. What is the meaning of that part of the bill? The engineer officer would not be placed in command of a vessel. What is the object? In the bill there is no other change of existing law. This simply defines who the officers shall be in the Revenue-Cutter Service. The law now provides for that. The amendment which has already been adopted to the bill, if the section remains, provides that there shall be no increased number of officers. That section as read would have granted an unlimited increased number of officers. I can see no reason for keeping this section in the bill at all. It does not destroy or affect the harmony of the bill in any other respect whatever.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the section of the Revised Statutes which provides for Revenue-Cutter officers provides that each boat shall have one captain, one first lieutenant, etc. This does not change that law, so far as that is concerned, but this will preserve in some degree the symmetry in the law. It provides in one single statute all there is in the Revised Statutes in reference to the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. MANN. How does it affect the symmetry of the bill? I do not know.

Mr. SHERMAN. It puts into this one statute all the law relating to the officers which is contained in sections 2749, 2950, and 3059 of the Revised Statutes. It puts them altogether into this one act. It consolidates the law.

Mr. MANN. You mean it simply takes two consecutive sections of the Revised Statutes and puts them in one?

Mr. SHERMAN. It does that, and does more.

Mr. MANN. I would like to understand, if I may, what more it does, if the gentleman can inform the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to strike out all the first section after the enacting clause.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the said commissioned officers shall rank as follows: Captains with majors in the Army and lieutenant-commanders in the Navy; first lieutenants with captains in the Army and lieutenants in the Navy; second lieutenants with first lieutenants in the Army and lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy; third lieutenants with second lieutenants in the Army and ensigns in the Navy; *Provided*, That whenever forces of the Navy and Revenue-Cutter Service shall be serving in cooperation pursuant to law (section 2757, Revised Statutes), the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service shall rank as follows: Captains with and next after lieutenant-commanders in the Navy; first lieutenants with and next after lieutenants in the Navy; second lieutenants with and next after lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy; third lieutenants with and next after ensigns in the Navy.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am advised by the committee that they withdraw the amendment they suggested, and I now offer in lieu of that an amendment that is drawn to accomplish the same purpose, but in different language. It was drawn by Admiral Evans, of the Navy, and therefore is more satisfactory to the objections of the Navy from a technical point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the bill does not show any committee amendment.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Then there is no necessity of withdrawing any amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine offers the following amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of section 2 the following:

"*Provided further*, That no provision of this act shall be construed as giving any officer of the Revenue-Cutter Service military or other control at any time over any vessel, officer, or man of the naval service, nor shall any naval officer exercise such military or other control over any vessel, officer, or man of the Revenue-Cutter Service, except by the direction of the President."



Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine showed me the amendment which has been offered, but since he showed it to me I would like to call his attention and the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill to a fact. This amendment is a concession, as I understand it, and provides that a Revenue-Cutter officer shall not have command of a naval vessel where the naval vessel and the Revenue-Cutter vessel cooperate. Would not it, on the same line, be advisable to insert after the word "Navy" the word "Army," because this bill would place the military force of the Government under the control of the Revenue-Cutter officer if they happen to be serving in cooperation, as might be the case?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will say that, so far as I am concerned, I am not thoroughly advised as to the relations that may exist between the two services. Admiral Evans suggested that this would be entirely sufficient for the Navy.

Mr. MANN. Yes, as to the Navy; but the gentleman understands the reason of making the relative ranks of the Army and Navy is to determine who shall have command when they cooperate. Here is a proposition that will leave the Revenue-Cutter officer in command if he cooperates with the captain of the Army.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. So far as I am advised, I do not know that anyone interested in or representing the Army establishment has made any complaint or raised any objection to this. I do not undertake to say that there may not be something in the gentleman's point.

Mr. MANN. Nobody has spoken to me from the Navy on the subject.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Maine a question.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Very well.

Mr. LACEY. As I read the amendment, it prevents any officer of the Navy taking command over a revenue cutter unless directed to do so by the President.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. LACEY. So if the revenue cutter came into line, he would have to wait and telegraph the President of the United States before the Navy could use that ship in evolutions about to be performed.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The Revenue-Cutter Service does not cooperate with the Navy except under the direction of the President of the United States in the first instance. So the condition suggested by the gentleman from Iowa is not likely to occur.

Mr. LACEY. We already have a law for that. Here is a provision where if a Revenue-Cutter vessel comes to the aid of a naval officer you make the proposition that the naval officer shall not take command over the revenue cutter unless you get the direct action of the President of the United States upon that proposition. Now, it seems to me that this is an unnecessary limitation. If we are going to put the cutters upon the open water with the Navy because they are needed in war, why should they not be commanded by officers of the Navy with whom they are to cooperate?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I move to strike out the last word in order to answer the gentleman from Iowa. I will say that this amendment, not in the precise language that this is drawn, was submitted to the Secretary of the Navy, and was approved of by the Secretary of the Navy, also by Judge-Advocate-General Lemly, and takes care of the conditions referred to by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is there any desire on the part of the friends of the bill to place the captain of the Army under the direction of the captain of the Revenue-Cutter Service?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. What harm would there be in inserting after the word "Navy" the word "Army."

Mr. HEPBURN. Why should that be done? Can the gentleman point to an instance where the Revenue-Cutter Service and the Army ever served together, so as to bring about the possible collision that is spoken of? In point of fact, this is simply a matter of sentiment. There has never been, I am told, a conflict of any character with regard to who should command when revenue cutters and naval vessels were serving together. During a hundred years that occasion has never happened. Yet for the purpose of yielding to a sentiment we have consented to this provision. As appeared from an extract which I read, and which gentlemen will remember, there was some sentiment on the part of certain naval officers on this subject; but there never has been a contention of any kind with reference to the Army. The gentleman from Illinois is simply encumbering the bill by undertaking to provide for a condition that never has been heard of and probably in the nature of things can not be heard of until our Army becomes webfooted. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Now, I think the gentleman, if I can have his at-

tention, will acknowledge his mistake. There has never been, up to the present time, any condition of existing law which could possibly place a Revenue-Cutter officer in command over an Army officer. But here we have a bill which, if enacted into law, will say that a Revenue-Cutter officer shall rank with certain Army officers. That provision might place the Revenue-Cutter officer in command. Such a condition never has occurred before, because it could not under the law as it has heretofore existed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word. I do not believe that the careful attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the wording and force of this bill ought to be accepted by the friends of the bill. I take it that he will not vote for the bill, and that his care and attention and zeal as to the precise meaning of the language is not exactly in the direction of a fatherly interest for the outcome of this legislation. I presume that if we confirm all his suggestions he will yet vote against the bill upon the great question that he has been fighting about here for three or four days. I think the friends of the bill had better amend it as they see fit, if they have sufficient numbers to pass the bill, and take the responsibility for its passage as they want it, and not as some of its enemies want it.

Mr. MANN. I do not expect the friends of this bill to insert anything in it because I want it; but if I could appeal to the reason of some gentlemen here, except the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who probably will not be reasoned with, it might not hurt them. The question is as to the merit of any proposition which may be offered. I do not expect to vote for the bill, but I believe that if it passes it ought to be made as good as possible, and that we ought to remove as many of the objections as we can.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Maine.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. LITTLEFIELD was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the commissioned officers of the United States Revenue-Cutter Service shall hereafter receive the same pay and allowances, except forage, as are now or may hereafter be provided by law for officers of corresponding rank in the Army, including longevity pay.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I move to amend by striking out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest and, I frankly admit, with a great deal of instruction to the discussion upon this very important bill. I have heard the distinguished gentleman from Maine, in a matchless manner, style, and spirit, not unusual to him, speaking of those who have given but little time or thought, according to their opportunity, to an investigation of the merits or demerits of this bill. I have learned, Mr. Chairman, in the affairs and controversies of life, intellectual or otherwise, that it takes something more than the earnest declaration of "the pronoun I" to make an argument. Some gentlemen may vainly believe that such is argument, but common-sense, plain people do not accept it exactly that way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question involved in this bill, and it is one on which I base my opposition principally, is, first (and there has been no explanation on this point made even by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, for whose opinion I have so high a regard on all subjects), Why is it that this Congress should be called upon to take an officer upon waiting orders or on the retired list who is getting \$1,250—an officer unable to render any service—and give him under the provisions of this bill \$2,500? That is a question that has not been explained or answered in any way whatsoever during this entire discussion.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BELLAMY] made the statement in his remarks that I was entirely mistaken about the section of the Revised Statutes which I had read applying to the pay of commanders, lieutenant-commanders, etc., in the Navy. Just such mistakes as the gentleman from North Carolina made have occurred, I think, throughout this discussion. I examined the personnel bill passed by Congress on March 3, 1899, and found that the gentleman from North Carolina omitted to read the latter part of it, which says:

And provided, That no provision of this act shall operate to reduce the present pay of any commissioned officer now in the Navy.

Hence it was the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BELLAMY] that was mistaken, as clearly appears from the proviso just read to the act of Congress of March 3, 1899.

And yet he says that I was mistaken about the statute. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that some of the gentlemen who made such broad declarations about it and engaged "in pyrotechnics," as did the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], ought probably to have given more time and attention to the bill and examination of it than they did. Now, Mr. Chairman, I

have objected to this bill on another ground. Why is it that in section 3, when the bill proposes to make revenue-cutter officers equal in rank to the naval officers and claim that they should be a part and parcel and belong to the Navy—why do they take the Army as a basis of compensation? It is plain and unmistakable what is meant by it, and the revenue officer to-day, without conditions or qualifications, under this bill will receive a greater compensation than the lieutenant-commander in the Navy, and there is no denial of it and there can not be. That is the plain provision of the bill.

I object to it again, Mr. Chairman, because I have read and seen that every Secretary of the Treasury, as has been alleged, and as is true, I presume, has favored this legislation. Why is it, I ask, that the gentlemen in favor of the bill have not been able to find Secretaries of the Navy that have favored it? I read to the committee that ex-Secretary Tracy, of the Navy, indicated that he would have agreed to a bill on this line only on condition that it transferred the Revenue-Cutter Service to the Navy absolutely. That was substantially the condition that Secretary Long made. Why, Mr. Chairman, if we are to take the opinions of Secretaries of the Treasury on a subject of this kind, why would not the opinion of a lawyer be just as well upon the question of whether or not a man had the yellow fever? Why would not his opinion be just as valuable upon a question of sickness on feeling the patient's pulse?

Let us go to the Navy, of which they propose to make this service a part, and let them answer the question as to whether this Revenue-Cutter Service shall be made an independent branch of the Navy—yea, whether the revenue officers shall receive more pay than officers of the Navy of corresponding rank receive. That is the unjust and unfair discrimination that this bill makes. Ah, Mr. Chairman, we ought to pause and consider this reckless increase of the tax burdens of the people. Is it right to take a man who has retired on a waiting list at \$1,250 per year, and without an additional act on his part retire him for life on a salary of \$2,500 per year? The people will not fail to scan carefully and critically the drift of such a bill as this, and will demand of the gentlemen who support it a clear, convincing, and satisfactory explanation as to why we should create a civil pension retirement list. The clamor will be long and loud from other Government employees, if this bill becomes law, "Give!" "Give!" "Give!"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment which I will ask the Clerk to read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "Army" in line 18, on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the word "Navy."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, it is peculiar that this service should be continually referred to as similar to the naval service, and then when it comes to a question of pay that it should be put upon the same footing as the Army service. I say it is peculiar, and there must be some reason why instead of following the line of the Navy pay, which would be natural, the bill should fix the Army pay, when the service of the revenue cutter is entirely different from that of the Army.

I shall attempt to show, Mr. Chairman, why this discrimination is made and why it is in favor of the Revenue-Cutter Service. If this service is so similar to the naval service, why should they not have the pay of officers of corresponding rank in the naval service? But we find that there is a provision in the law of the United States which says that when a naval officer is performing shore duty his salary shall be subjected to a discount of 15 per cent as long as he remains on shore duty. Now, evidently the friends of this bill must have wanted to give the Revenue-Cutter Service officer that amount of money, which would be 15 per cent more than the naval officer gets. Let us see how this works in the case of a captain.

According to this bill a captain who has served twenty years will get a salary of \$3,500. Now, in case he does shore duty he still gets that \$3,500, but the naval officer does not get it. He is subjected to a discount of \$525 upon his salary, and consequently it is placing the Revenue-Cutter officer in a position which makes him \$525 better off in his year's salary than the naval officer. Not only that, but we find that the members of this Revenue-Cutter Service are stationed on shore just like the officers in the naval service; and if the salary of the naval officer should be discounted 15 per cent, why should not that of the Revenue-Cutter Service officer be also discounted a like amount?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Maine?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do you understand that the Revenue-Cutter officers alternate in shore and sea duty like the naval officers?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I understand that right now there are 40 officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service that are assigned to shore duty.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That, I beg leave to suggest, I do not think is true.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I was so informed.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I have got a list that I will read to you, which shows there are but eighteen.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well, eighteen.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. My question is this, whether you understand the Revenue-Cutter officers alternate between shore and sea duty; that is, say, three years on sea and three years on shore.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know whether there is any length of time designated, but no matter what the length of time may be you are going to have the naval officer come in here and say, "We are discriminated against; you give an officer of the Revenue-Cutter Service \$525 a year more for the corresponding work than you give us." You will then find that this House will increase the salary of the naval officers to that amount. Now, it seems to me that when we take that into consideration we ought to fix the same salaries for the corresponding officers of the two services. The reason the word "army" has been inserted in this bill instead of the word "navy" is because the Army is always on shore duty and consequently there is no discount on their salaries by reason of the fact that they serve in one particular place or another.

But in the case of the Navy you can readily see that it is important that there should be a difference. All of the Navy would be seeking shore duty and all of these officers will be seeking shore duty if you adopt this measure by which they get the same salary when they are doing shore service as when they are doing duty at sea. Consequently, it seems to me that it is eminently proper that if this service is the same as the naval service the pay should be the same as the naval pay. I therefore contend that this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] to say that there were only 18 Revenue-Cutter officers on shore.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I gave the list that was given to me. That is all I know about it.

Mr. MANN. I have a statement here from the Chief of the Revenue-Cutter Service, which statement is only a few days old, and according to this there are 9 officers on special duty on shore; 12 officers on construction and repair duty on shore; 12 officers on live-saving service duty on shore, and 8 officers on waiting-order duty on shore, sick, which makes a total of 41, I believe, if I can count correctly.

Mr. HEPBURN. But the gentleman ought in all fairness to remember that twelve of those, those on construction and repair duty, are officers who are expected to be on shore. Their place is on shore. They are engaged in construction, in the building of ships.

Mr. MANN. I am not complaining about these gentlemen being on shore. It is eminently proper that all of them should be on shore. They are all engaged on shore except the eight on waiting orders, and there are undoubtedly good reasons for them, in that they are sick; but all of these officers are engaged in duty on shore, and why should they not be paid Navy wages on shore?

Mr. HEPBURN. Eight of those you speak of are the old and infirm that are on shore because they can not serve.

Mr. MANN. That is what the gentleman says—the old and infirm. I notice that two of them are second assistant engineers. They can not be very old. I do not know how infirm they are.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I will give the gentleman from Illinois the benefit of the authority on which I made the statement:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
DIVISION OF REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE,  
Washington, March 31, 1902.

HON. CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD, M. C.,  
The Hamilton, Washington, D. C.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will remember that this comes out of my time, and the gentleman can just omit the names.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Certainly; the second or two that it took to read the names will be taken out of my time.

MY DEAR MR. LITTLEFIELD: I hand you herewith the names of officers on shore duty at this time, 18 in all.

Seven of the officers, employed in the construction and repair of vessels, will go to duty on board ship as soon as the vessels building are finished.

There would be under ordinary conditions, with no vessels under construction, including the chief and engineer in chief of the service, on shore duty in the Revenue-Cutter Service, about 12 officers.

If you desire any other data I will be glad to respond in person or by letter, as you wish.

Very truly, yours,

C. F. SHOEMAKER.

Now I will put into the RECORD, if the gentleman pleases, the names of the officers:

OFFICERS ON SHORE DUTY CONNECTED WITH REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Capt. Charles F. Shoemaker, chief Division Revenue-Cutter Service.

Capt. of Engineers John W. Collins, engineer in chief.

Capt. L. N. Stodder, supervisor of anchorages, New York.



Capt. R. M. Clark, inspector of clothing.  
First Lieut. D. P. Foley, in charge general store, Pacific coast.  
Second Lieut. P. H. Brereton, temporarily at Department.

#### IN THE CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR OF VESSELS.

[Assignments in these cases are all temporary.]

Capt. Russell Glover, Capt. O. C. Hamlet, Capt. Geo. E. McConnell, Second Lieut. G. C. Carmine, Chief Engineer James A. Doyle, Chief Engineer D. McC. French, Chief Engineer James H. Chalker, Chief Engineer E. G. Schwartz, First Asst. Engineer C. A. McAllister, First Asst. Engineer John Q. Walton, First Asst. Engineer Carl M. Green, Second Asst. Engineer C. A. Wheeler.

That is the authority on which I made the statement. I know nothing about it personally.

Mr. MANN. Well, I have the authority of the Chief of the Cutter Service, Mr. Shoemaker also, giving 41 in a schedule which I will put in the RECORD.

The schedule is as follows:

Table showing the distribution of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service March, 1902.

Grades.	In command.	Attached to vessels other than commanding.	On special duty.	Construction and repair.	On duty Life-Saving Service.	Lieutenants in command.	On waiting orders.	Sick.	Total.
Captains	23		3	3	5	3			37
First lieutenants	18	3	3		5	11			37
Second lieutenants	31	2	1		2				36
Third lieutenants	23								24
Cadets	12								12
Captain of engineers		1							1
Chief engineers	29		4						35
First assistant engineers	14		2				1		17
Second assistant engineers	16		1				2		19
Constructor			1						1
Total	23	143	9	12	12	11	8		219

Mr. MANN. Now, I am not criticising these gentlemen for being on shore at all; but if the naval officers of the same grade on shore have 15 per cent less pay, why should these gentlemen have higher pay? You know that it will mean that the Navy officers will insist that their pay be increased. Perhaps that is true. If so, increase them both at once.

Mr. MAHON. You give these men less pay when they are retired than naval officers receive, and you want to cut down their pay on shore.

Mr. MANN. No, sir; this bill proposes to give them the same pay on the water as the naval officers and 15 per cent more pay on shore than the naval officers.

Mr. HEPBURN. Let me ask the gentleman if he understands this matter as I do. You propose by this amendment to place them on retirement on the same ground as the naval officers.

Mr. MANN. No; this is their pay for active service.

Mr. HEPBURN. But that fixes the retirement pay.

Mr. MANN. No, sir.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes; that fixes the retirement pay, and your proposition would retire each one of them with a grade higher. Of course that would not affect captains, because there is no grade higher, but it would affect all lieutenants. Is that what you want to do?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is now endeavoring to discuss the retirement feature of this bill. We are endeavoring to discuss the pay in active service under the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. The retirement pay is based on the active pay.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman wants to pay revenue-cutter officers in active service 15 per cent more than the naval officers of the corresponding grade receive. There is no question about it, and the gentleman admits it. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, let us not vote until we know what we are voting about. I would like to ask my colleague, who is fully acquainted with all the facts, if the same corresponding rank in the Army and Navy have the same pay. Is that correct?

Mr. HEPBURN. What does the gentleman mean by corresponding rank?

Mr. LACEY. That is, a man who has corresponding rank with a captain of the Army, would his pay be the equivalent of the pay of a captain in the Army? Is that correct? I mean, a man who had the corresponding rank with a captain in the Army would draw pay equivalent to the pay of a captain in the Army; but if he was in the Navy, with the same identical rank, he would draw 15 per cent less when on shore duty.

Mr. HEPBURN. Where do you find that?

Mr. LACEY. I am trying to find out the facts.

Mr. HEPBURN. The pay of the Navy is based on the pay of the Army. When the pay of the Army was fixed, there was no Navy; but when the naval establishment came into existence their pay was based on the pay of the Army, and that is the condition to-day, as I understand it.

Mr. LACEY. And if that is so, the naval officer on shore draws 15 per cent less than when he is at sea, but the revenue officer will draw precisely the same as he would when at sea. If that is true, it ought not to be, and we ought not to vote upon it until we find out the facts. If that is correct, we ought to adopt the amendment; and when we come to give them retirement simply say that they shall not be retired one grade higher, as in the Navy. From the statement made by my colleague, this amendment ought be adopted.

When an officer of the Navy is on shore he gets 15 per cent less, and this bill would give the revenue men the full pay. That would be the legal effect of it if this amendment is not adopted. I was simply trying to get the facts. I have thus far been listening to this debate without taking any part in it. If these be the facts, we ought to adopt the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman understand that a captain of the Revenue-Cutter Service ranks with a captain in the Navy?

Mr. LACEY. I am talking about the assimilated rank, as in the Navy.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. This does not say "assimilated" rank, but corresponding rank.

Mr. LACEY. Corresponding rank has practically the same meaning. So that the rank being the same, the Revenue-Cutter officer will get 15 per cent more pay than the naval officer does when he is on shore.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. When the naval officer is on shore?

Mr. LACEY. The most of them are on shore.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What, the Navy?

Mr. LACEY. The Revenue-Cutter Service officers.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. They are always at sea.

Mr. LACEY. Over 40 of them are now on shore, and those 40 would draw 15 per cent more than Navy officers do when they are on shore duty.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. But that 40 includes those on the retired list, does it not?

Mr. LACEY. If there was only one of these instead of 40, it is wrong. The proposition is unworthy. We ought to be just to the Navy. In trying to make the Revenue-Cutter men equal to the Navy we should not put them on a better plane.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think my friend does not understand what he is talking about.

Mr. LACEY. I am endeavoring to get the facts.

Mr. HEPBURN. You have been opposing the bill?

Mr. LACEY. I have never spoken against the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). And therefore I doubt very much your sincerity in this matter.

Mr. LACEY. I do not question the gentleman's sincerity.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing). Especially in view of the section—

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen will not impugn the motives of fellow-members.

Mr. HEPBURN. I was not impugning the motive; I was stating a historical fact.

Mr. LACEY. Well, then, it will become history that my friend has put into the RECORD what I expected to put there a little later when I shall record my vote against the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. The act of March 3, 1899, provides, in section 12, that—

After June 30, 1899, commissioned officers of the line of the Navy and of the Medical and Pay Corps shall receive the same pay and allowances except for forage as are or may be provided for by or in pursuance of law for officers of corresponding rank in the Navy.

Mr. LACEY. For officers of the corresponding rank of the Army.

Mr. HEPBURN. Very well.

Mr. LACEY. Now, how about the other provision about 15 per cent less on shore?

Mr. HEPBURN. The pay of the Navy has always been based on the pay of the Army, and we have based this in pursuance of all precedents.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But there is the 15 per cent difference in the pay when the naval officer is on shore.

Mr. HEPBURN. We will consent to it if the House says so.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But that says that the pay shall be 15 per cent less on shore.

Mr. HEPBURN. We do not agree to have the enemies of the bill fix it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LACEY. I would like to have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LACEY. We have at last got at the fact, as I understand it, and that is this: While the rate of the pay is the same, a man that has the corresponding rank in the Revenue-Cutter Service

has the same pay as a like officer in the Navy. We have got at last the fact that is important for us all to know. If that is true, why should we make a provision that these Revenue-Cutter officers shall not have their pay discounted while on shore the same as a naval officer? The amendment of the gentleman from Colorado simply puts the Revenue-Cutter officer on the same footing as the naval officer instead of upon a better footing. I am surprised that my colleague in his zeal should insist on giving 15 per cent more to the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service than to the officers of the Navy.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to a letter from the Paymaster-General of the United States Navy, in which he answers the question, What would be the pay of a lieutenant-commander of the Navy, both on shore and on sea service? And here is his answer:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 26, 1903.

SIR: The Bureau is in receipt of your letter of the 24th instant, requesting the rate of pay of a lieutenant-commander in the Navy who has a service of twenty years, both for sea duty and shore duty; and in reply thereto begs to inform you that an officer of this rank and service receives, while at sea, \$3,500, without any allowances, and on shore, in the United States, \$2,975 and quarters. If quarters are not furnished in kind, he is entitled to commutation thereof at the rate of \$48 per month.

Respectfully,

A. S. KENNY,

Paymaster-General United States Navy.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

There is a statement of the Paymaster-General of the Navy made on the 26th of February of this year, in which he says that the difference between the pay of an officer of the Navy holding the rank of lieutenant-commander at sea and on shore is 15 per cent more at sea than the corresponding officer would receive on shore, and that ought to settle it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me in view of that fact there ought to be no objection whatever to the passage of this amendment which substitutes the pay of the Navy as applied to this service instead of the pay of the Army. It would be a discrimination against the Navy to say that these officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service for the same identical shore duty should receive 15 per cent more salary than the corresponding officers of the Navy.

Mr. Chairman, it will result without the peradventure of a doubt in a bill coming into this House, and result in the passage of a bill increasing the pay of the naval officers on shore duty to correspond to the pay of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service on shore duty. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but from the standpoint of the best service there ought to be a distinction between shore duty and sea duty. If a Revenue-Cutter officer gets the same pay on shore that he gets for sea duty, unquestionably he will always be seeking shore duty, and the result will be that men will not voluntarily go to sea when they can get the same pay by staying in port. Therefore it seems to me in the best interests of the service, in the interest of having uniformity in the Revenue-Cutter Service and in the naval service, that the amendment I have offered striking out the word "Army" and inserting the word "Navy" should be adopted.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not controvert the statement of the gentleman from Colorado as to what the statute is; but when you apply it to practice you come to a very different condition of facts. The highest grade in the Revenue-Cutter Service is that of captain, and that officer corresponds to lieutenant-commander in the Navy. The pay of such officer (lieutenant-commander) is \$3,500, and yet when the naval officer is assigned to shore duty, when he is brought here into the Department, when he is placed at the head of a bureau, I think the gentleman will find that there is not an exception that that officer is made a rear-admiral.

He takes the rank of a rear-admiral when he is placed in the Navy Department at the head of a bureau. His pay is thus increased \$1,000 a year. So, in fact and in practice, Mr. Chairman, although the law is as the gentleman from Colorado states it, in practice the naval officer when assigned to shore duty has increased pay rather than decreased pay.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from Iowa to say that one-half of the naval officers were on shore duty all the time. I know there are a great many rear-admirals, but I did not suppose one-half of the officers of the Navy were rear-admirals. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. My purpose was to vote for this measure. I do not presume there is any man on the floor of this House that has a deeper interest in the Navy than I have myself, for all I have on earth is in the Navy. Yet I am willing to vote for this measure if the measure can be treated fairly and honestly.

I do not believe those who are opposing the measure are dishonest, neither do I believe those who are in favor of it intentionally intend to mislead the House; but I say to you it is a fact, and it is a fact that can not be controverted by the gentleman

from New York, that when a naval officer leaves the sea and comes upon shore duty he loses 15 per cent of his pay. Now, that distinction is absolutely in the statutes; and if the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] had only read one line further he would have exposed the truth of that fact.

The pay of the Navy is based upon that of the Army, and when the naval officer is on shore his pay is 15 per cent less. And now you propose to step in here and do this for the Revenue Service: You propose to give these officers 15 per cent extra above that of the Navy, while you make no reduction upon the pay of the Army.

The gentleman says that when naval officers come ashore they are always assigned to service in the Navy Department. I beg leave to differ with the gentleman decidedly; and I want to tell him that naval officers have no allowance for quarters. If there are quarters for them at the navy-yard or elsewhere they get them; but otherwise they go into the city and rent their quarters and pay for them. That is the naked truth about the matter.

Let gentlemen treat this question fairly and honestly before the House. With the amendment now proposed, I will cheerfully vote for this bill. I have been lobbied, it is true, by both sides on this question, but I will say that I will vote for the bill cheerfully if you give us the amendment asked for by the gentleman from Colorado, which I believe is right and just; otherwise I will not.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado, which is to strike out the word "Army," and to insert in place thereof the word "Navy."

Mr. ROBERTS. I move to amend by striking out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken on this proposition, it seems to me there is another phase of the question which should be fairly understood by this committee. It is said here that in supporting the section as proposed by the committee we are discriminating in favor of the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service; and instances of officers of the Navy having their pay reduced on account of shore service are cited in proof of that statement.

Now, let me say right here, Mr. Chairman, that the benefit of this sea pay will only accrue permanently to two officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service. One is the chief of the service; the other the chief engineer of the service. Under the law those two officers are detailed to shore duty for a certain specific purpose; that is, to manage the affairs of that Bureau and to undertake or supervise the designing and construction of all the vessels built for the use of that Department.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when the Secretary of the Navy assigns men to shore duty at the head of similar bureaus, those men are advanced in grade, which means an increase of pay. If you adopt the amendment proposed here by the gentleman from Colorado, you in effect impose a penalty upon the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service who are detailed ashore for this construction duty.

The statement of the chief of the service is that under normal conditions there may be in all 12 officers of this service on shore duty at one time; but 10 of these, being those outside of the two I have mentioned, are on shore merely for a day, a week, or a month or two; they are not stationed on shore for three years at a time, as are officers of the Navy. They are brought on shore for a very short time, at the expiration of which they go back to their ships. They do not get a permanent location on shore where they can locate their families, where they can hire a house and settle down. It seems to me that when we take this view of the matter, it is proper that these officers should get the full sea pay.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman allow an interruption?

Mr. ROBERTS. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. NORTON. Does not the gentleman make a mistake when he undertakes to advise the House that naval officers are three years at sea and three years on shore? There is no such law as that at all.

Mr. ROBERTS. I have not stated that such is the law; I have stated that it is the practice of the Navy Department—a naval regulation which has the force and effect of law. And it must be within the observation of the gentleman from Ohio that when a naval officer is assigned as the head of a bureau he stays there at least during the continuance of the political administration that puts him there, and in many instances he stays there much longer, and being promoted he receives an increase of pay. Let me give you a concrete case. Take, for instance, the case of the recent Chief of the Bureau of Construction in the Navy Department. Prior to his advancement to the position of Chief of that Bureau he was a naval constructor. When he went up from the position of naval constructor, where, I believe, he ranked as a lieutenant in the Navy, he at once became a rear-admiral, drawing a rear-admiral's pay, this being compensation to him for the extra duty imposed on him by reason of this assignment.



Mr. NORTON. What about the thirty or forty or fifty men under him, that are out in the other departments, that are not at the Department—where do they get their rank?

Mr. ROBERTS. Those men are getting an equivalent.

Mr. NORTON. What is it?

Mr. ROBERTS. In almost every instance they are getting commutation in cold, hard cash for their quarters aboard ship.

Mr. LESSLER. I understand the naval constructor has no sea duty.

Mr. NORTON. Certainly not; we do not claim he has.

Mr. LESSLER. That is what you ask.

Mr. NORTON. No; I do not claim the naval constructor has any sea duty.

Mr. ROBERTS. Then will the gentleman kindly tell me what officers of the Navy are under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Bureau of Construction? I mean by that sailors, men who are supposed to be out on ships, and who are on shore—seamen. What officers of the Navy come under the Chief of Construction?

Mr. NORTON. I do not think there are any.

Mr. ROBERTS. Then there is no relevancy to the question of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield a moment?

Mr. ROBERTS. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman from Ohio, who I think is on the Naval Committee—

Mr. NORTON. No; I am not. I wish I were.

Mr. HEPBURN. He is akin to the Navy.

Mr. ROBERTS. He has a kin in the Navy.

Mr. NORTON. So I have, and I am proud of it, too.

Mr. ROBERTS. So am I, and I wish there were more of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. There is one provision of the law the gentleman from Ohio did not read. My statement was absolutely correct. A further proviso reads that no provision of this act shall operate to reduce the present pay of any commissioned officer now in the Navy, and in any case in which the pay of such an officer would otherwise be reduced he shall continue to receive pay according to existing law.

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. What becomes, then, of your 15 per cent?

Mr. NORTON. Read the second provision.

Mr. HEPBURN. I have; and I say that there is no reduction, no 15 per cent reduction, of the pay of any officer in the Navy at the time of the passage of this bill.

Mr. NORTON. I do not know as to the time of the passage of this bill. I know this bill gives him 15 per cent reduction.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

Several MEMBERS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MANN. The friends of the bill will not help it in that way. There can be no possible question as to the reduction of pay on shore duty from sea pay. The personnel bill which the gentleman from Iowa referred to, as I understand it, provided that that bill should not operate to reduce pay. There is no possible question about there being a number of officers on shore. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] made a suggestion which, it seems to me, the friends of this bill ought to adopt. I should be glad, although not intending to vote for the bill itself, to vote for an amendment to the bill which would give to the chief of the Revenue-Cutter Service and to the captain of engineers higher salaries. I am frank to admit that I do not believe that Captain Shoemaker and Captain Collins receive salaries fairly proportionate to the responsibilities which are placed upon them. As chiefs practically of a bureau, even under this bill they would receive only \$3,500 a year and commutation for quarters. I believe their salaries ought to be higher, but I can see no reason for giving higher salaries to other officials on shore than naval officers would receive in like positions.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] just allow me to take his attention a moment? You say that there is no law in existence now that deducts 15 per cent from the pay of a naval officer.

Mr. HEPBURN. Two officers of the Navy who were officers on the 3d of March, 1899—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. How do you construe, then, section 1556 of the present statutes of the United States, which says that lieutenant-commanders—

Mr. HEPBURN. What is the date of that?

Mr. MANN. It is prior to 1899.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Yet it is in existence under the personnel act which you have just read—under the proviso. This is the law that is in existence.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, no; I read the statute—the proviso exempting all officers in the Navy at the date of the passage of that act from the operation of that 15 per cent discount.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Now, Mr. Chairman, the whole question is about this personnel act, and I undertook to read the proviso in the first few remarks that I made this afternoon, which was that it should not apply to the pay of naval officers as the law now exists. Now, what is that law that exists to-day? The personnel act did not repeal the question of compensation, and here is the law as I understand it:

Lieutenant-commanders during the first four years after date of commission, when at sea, \$2,800; on shore duty, \$2,400; on leave or waiting orders, \$2,000; after four years from such date, when at sea, \$3,000; on shore duty, \$2,600; on leave or waiting orders, \$2,200.

And, Mr. Chairman, that is the law to-day, and there has not been any contradiction or denial of the fact that a captain to-day in the Revenue Service, under this bill, who has corresponding rank and pay with the officer in the Navy, as I have just read, does get larger pay than a lieutenant-commander in the Navy. That is the statute as it exists, just as I have read it, and it applies to officers all down the line, and when they are on shore duty 15 per cent is deducted from their pay. Is that deduction in any way made in the case of a captain in the Revenue Service, corresponding with the rank of a lieutenant-commander in the Navy? No man can say that it is.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendment be closed in one minute.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. NORTON. I ask the gentleman to yield that one minute to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his motion?

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendment close in one minute.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LACEY. Division.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LACEY. Division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded. Those in favor of the motion will rise.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ROBERTS. I understood the Chair to recognize the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] before recognizing the call for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] was on his feet demanding a division, but the Chair did not distinctly hear him until he spoke the second time.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 70, nays 36.

Accordingly the motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, no matter what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] may say, we have a letter from the Paymaster-General of the Navy which says that in the month of February he was paying officers of the Navy on shore 15 per cent less than he was paying Navy officers on sea duty. It seems to me that ought to settle the question whether we can now turn to the particular statute that authorizes it or not.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] says that we are discriminating against the Revenue-Cutter Service by the adoption of this amendment. Why, Mr. Chairman, we are increasing the pay of a captain who has had twenty years' service 40 per cent, giving him \$3,500 a year and a commutation of quarters of \$576 per annum, when he has had heretofore a salary of \$2,500 a year and commutation of quarters of \$480 per annum. We are increasing his compensation for quarters by giving him \$48 per month instead of \$40 per month. That is not discriminating against the Revenue-Cutter Service. It is giving them a large and liberal increase of compensation. If we make a difference between the compensation of the Navy and Revenue-Cutter officers there will continually be a quarrel as to their salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] to strike out the word "Army" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Navy."

The question being taken on a division (demanded by Mr. SHERMAN), there were—ayes 75, nays 76.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. SHAFROTH and Mr. SHERMAN.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 76, nays 89. Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LACEY. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment which will be read by the Clerk.

Mr. LACEY. It is to be added to the section as a proviso. The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of section 3 the following:  
"Provided, That the same reduction of pay shall be made for shore duty as in corresponding grades in the Navy."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SHERMAN. I raise the point of order that precisely the same amendment, only in different phraseology, has just been voted down.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to be heard on the point of order. Mr. SHERMAN. We have voted what the pay should be. We have voted that it should be Army pay. This amendment provides that it shall be Navy pay. That is precisely the same question upon which we have just this moment taken a vote by tellers.

Mr. LACEY. And we voted it down on the mistaken statement of gentlemen that there was no shore reduction. Now, here is a proviso that if there is shore reduction in the Navy there shall also be shore reduction in this service. If there is no shore reduction, then, of course, the proviso will not hurt them. It is an entirely different provision, even if the legal effect should be the same.

Mr. SHERMAN. Why, Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference whether the gentleman voted under a misapprehension or not; this is precisely the question that was voted down. It is the very same amendment, simply changing the phraseology, and nothing else.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion just voted down was the motion of the gentleman from Colorado to strike out the word "Army," and insert in lieu thereof the word "Navy." The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is to add at the end of the section the following words:

Provided, That the same reduction of pay shall be made for shore duty as in corresponding grades of the Navy.

The language of the pending amendment is certainly very different from that of the amendment already rejected. The Chair can not say, from anything appearing in the bill or anything that has been submitted, that it is the same amendment. In terms it is a very different amendment. What the effect may be of adopting the amendment is for the committee to consider and not for the Chair to decide. The point of order is therefore overruled. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LACEY. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 68, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That when any officer in the Revenue-Cutter Service has reached the age of 64 years he shall be retired by the President from active service; and when any officer has become incapable of performing the duties of his office he shall be either placed upon the retired waiting-orders list or dropped from the service by the President, as hereinafter provided.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out section 4 of the bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this section provides for these officers being put upon a civil-pension list. That is all that it amounts to. You may call it a retirement list or you may call this list anything that you want to, but in the end it puts civil employees on a retirement list, where they will receive three-fourths pay for the balance of their lives after they have ceased to work for the Government. Now, since the beginning of this Government this Revenue-Cutter Service has been in existence. There is no man on this floor that denies that it has been an efficient service; there is no man on this floor who denies that under existing law we have been able to obtain the services of competent and efficient men to serve the Government.

We hear gentlemen on this floor quote in this debate from Secretary this and Secretary that, what the Secretary of the Navy has to say, and what the Secretary of the Treasury has to say, and what a retired Secretary has to say, and what an active Secretary has to say; we hear from Admiral this and Admiral that, and Paymaster this and Paymaster that, and what he thinks we should do in this matter. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come when the American Congress ought to be able to legislate on its own judgment, and not have to run like messenger boys to a department to ascertain how they shall vote. There is no man here that can deny the present efficiency of this service or seeks to deny it. There is no man in this House who has asserted that the efficiency of this service is going to be increased one jot or one tittle by giving this civil-retirement list to these officers. Not a man in the debate that has taken place, not one man, has asserted that you are going to improve the service by putting this provision in this bill.

Every gentleman who favors the bill has lauded the service;

has told us what an efficient service it was. Well, now, instead of asking rear-admirals, vice-admirals, and retired admirals and active admirals how we shall vote in this matter, suppose we in our consciences ask our constituents as to whether they want to adopt and put on the statute books a civil-retirement pension list for service that admittedly does not need it. Shall we pay these men this money after they have retired, when every man admits that the service is efficient now? What can you say to your constituents as the reason for giving to officers of this service this bonus if the service is as efficient to-day as you say it is? And if you can not, why then you are going to open the public treasury and give a lot of pleasant gentlemen, because they lobby with you, and ask you to do it—you are going to give them this increase of pay without any return to the National Government.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, just a few moments. I more than agree, after listening to the gentleman from Alabama and hearing the reasons that he gives for the conclusions at which he arrives, that he cares but little about the language of this bill.

He says that it does not make any difference how this bill reads, and I am rather inclined to think that is a fact. It does not make any difference what anybody says about it or what anybody thinks about it; it means exactly "what I know" and "what I say" and "what the gentleman from Alabama says it means."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman deny that it makes a retired list?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. No; the gentleman does not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman deny the efficiency of the service now?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Not at all. I say it makes a retirement list. Does the gentleman know, and does the gentleman suppose that just because he says he does not want to inquire of the Secretary of the Treasury, nor does he want to inquire of the Secretary of the Navy, nor does he want to have this admiral or that advise us that no one else cares to do so. His hypothesis is that the less a man knows the better he is qualified to exercise his judgment as a representative of the American people. That is his proposition. Do not investigate a question, do not, in God's name, ask anybody who knows anything about it—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Maine assumes—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Do not trouble yourself about the gentleman from Maine; the gentleman from Maine will look out for himself. The gentleman from Alabama said he would not bother about admirals or about Secretaries of the Navy; he would look out for himself. I do not suppose he would even read or let himself be informed, because the less information a man has the more intelligent he is. Undoubtedly when he undertakes to act on a question he would consult his constituents. That is what he would do. It would be very unfortunate if hereafter a question arose in this House that required immediate action if the gentleman from Alabama did not have time to consult his constituents [laughter], because if he does not have the time he would not know how to vote. It would not do to ask the head of a department; it would not do to ask any representative of a department, because he may know what he is talking about; and if he did ask him he might get some information, and then he might act intelligently upon the information. [Laughter.] It is a mighty sight better to act upon misinformation or absolutely no information.

The gentleman asked me if the section does not provide for retirement. Of course it does; that is how it reads. No matter how it reads or what anybody says about it, he says, but I think it means what it says, and it reads that way.

Then the gentleman says that this is the first time that any attempt has been made to put these men on the retired list. Oh, this awful bugbear of a civil pension list; this terrible picture that they have conjured up, this "cloven foot," as my other friend from Alabama called it—the cat under the meal, and with no meal hardly over the cat. [Laughter.] What is the effect of it? The gentleman knows, or he would have known if he had listened to my friend from Iowa, that on two several occasions it has been necessary for the American Congress in the exercise of its wisdom to pass a retirement bill without consulting its constituents. Now, I do not know but there may be a constituent of the gentleman from Alabama that has consulted more than was necessary for the welfare of this bill from his point of view.

But on two occasions the American Congress, in its wisdom, has found it necessary to retire by special act men in this Revenue-Cutter Service. Why? Because they were considered not civil employees, but a part of the naval establishment of this Government, distinctly naval in their character, and that by reason of their service, its peculiar character, and the fact that men once enlisted and trained in that service are in a sense unfitted for other services, on two occasions it has been necessary to relieve the congestion by a special act of Congress and place these men on the retired list because they were incapacitated for further service.

No crack of doom, so far as I know, has opened itself wide to



ingulf either the American Congress or destroy the American people by reason of those two special acts, and the ship of state has not drifted anywhere near the rocks by reason of those two special acts of Congress. Nor was there, so far as I have been informed, any upheaval on the part of the constituents. This simply provides by general law for the retirement of these men under precisely the same circumstances, and would make it unnecessary hereafter for the Congress to pass this special legislation to relieve this congestion in this service.

Now, I think, Mr. Chairman, that the suggestion of the gentleman should hardly be adopted by the members of the House, because the bill places these men not on a par even with the Navy, as is well suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]; because in many important particulars and respects the law now relating to retirement is vastly more favorable to the naval officer, with which I make no complaint and with which I find no fault, than is this bill to the revenue-cutter officer, but it provides a way of placing them upon this list. If it did constitute a thin entering wedge, if it was a civil-pension list, I would agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] and be glad to follow his lead on this proposition, but I respectfully disagree with his conclusions, and I submit, under a fair analysis of the situation, it seems to me that no proper consideration of facts can justify the suggestion that the Revenue-Cutter Service is in any fair, proper sense a civil employment and is not entitled to the same treatment that the Navy receives in this respect.

Mr. UNDERWOOD rose.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Does the gentleman rise to a question?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and amendment be closed in two minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate upon the pending section and amendment be closed—

Mr. SHERMAN. I will make it two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. In two minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (called for by Mr. UNDERWOOD) there were—ayes 77, noes 66.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. SHERMAN were appointed.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 70, noes 65. So the motion to close the debate in two minutes was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the committee has seen fit to cut off debate on this proposition. After what the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] has seen fit to say in his exceedingly humorous and funny speech, I have little to say. The gentleman from Maine has played many parts in this House. I think it is the first time that I have ever seen him assume to play the rôle of the cap and bells; but he performs his part well, there is no doubt about that. [Laughter.] On the other hand, my friend from Maine states that I assume to know it all. Well, now, I do assume to know something, and probably I did assume to know it all until the gentleman from Maine came to this House [laughter]; but ever since the gentleman from Maine has been a member of this House I have found that he was not only capable of knowing it all, but of telling it and giving advice not only to his own party, whether they agreed with him or not, but to this side of the House as well. [Laughter.]

As the gentleman from Maine has never seen fit or necessary to go to anybody else for advice, except himself, I was therefore rather surprised when the gentleman objected to some few of us on this side consulting our constituencies rather than high admirals in authority. Now, as to the real merits in the case, the reason I say we should not go to admirals or Revenue-Cutter officers or persons of that kind for advice as to how we should vote, is simply from the fact that every one of those men are interested in some degree in the decision of the House in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Whereas we and our constituencies are only interested in good service to the Government and the revenues in the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to strike out the fourth section of the bill.

The question was taken; on a division called for by Mr. UNDERWOOD, there were—ayes 44 and noes 97.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The question being taken, and the demand for tellers, they were refused, 19 members, not one-fifth of a quorum, rising in support of the demand.

So the motion was not agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury, under the direction of the President, shall from time to time assemble a Revenue-Cutter Service retiring board, composed of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service and medical officers of the Marine-Hospital Service, consisting of not less than five commissioned officers, two-fifths of whom shall be selected from medical officers

of the Marine-Hospital Service, for the purpose of examining and reporting on such officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service as may be ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury to appear before it; and the members of said board shall be sworn, in every case, to discharge their duties honestly and impartially, the oath to be administered to the members by the president of the board, and to him by the junior member or recorder; and such board shall inquire into and determine the facts touching the nature and occasion of the disability of any officer who appears to be incapable of performing the duties of his office, and shall have such powers as may be necessary for that purpose; and when the board finds an officer incapacitated for active service it shall also find and report the cause which, in its judgment, has produced his incapacity, whether such cause is an incident of service, whether due to his own vicious habits, or the infirmities of age, or physical or mental disability. The proceedings and decisions of the board shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, and shall by him be laid before the President for his approval or disapproval and his orders in the case.

Mr. MANN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 5, line 4, page 3, by striking out the words "revenue cutter" and inserting the word "navy."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the futility of endeavoring to amend this bill against the objection of the gentlemen who have it in charge. This is an amendment which would, under ordinary circumstances, be accepted as proper, but I have no hope that they will accept it now when it is offered to them in this way.

Mr. Chairman, I was not able to hear the entire argument of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] this afternoon, because I felt the need of inner refreshment. During my absence from the Hall the gentleman, in a facetious tone, referred to me, saying that if there were anything in the theory of the transmigration of souls, "the gentleman from Illinois," referring to myself, "would at some future day be reincarnated and appear as a mule with four hind legs, all in vigorous operation." [Laughter.]

My remembrance is that the theory of the transmigration of souls is one which is held in the far East, in India, among the Hindoos. I do not pretend to have great knowledge in reference to that theory or great knowledge, indeed, in reference to any other subject; but the gentleman having compared me to a Hindoo, I may say that I feel very much like the Hindoo described in a rhyme which some of us have heard:

The poor benighted Hindoo,  
He does the best he kindo.  
He sticks to caste from first to last;  
And for clothes he makes his skindo.

[Laughter.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MANN, it was rejected.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, while I intend to vote for this bill, I shall not do so under any misapprehension of its true relation to the Government of the United States. The Revenue-Cutter Service is not a part of the War Department of the United States, neither is it a part of the Navy. Its incidental connection with the Spanish-American war no more justifies the crediting of the Revenue-Cutter Service to either of those departments than does the fact that bakers, butchers, printers, merchants, and lawyers fought in that war justify the placing of those engaged in those employments under the care of those departments. The regular duty of the revenue cutters is not in the line of war, and the employees of that service render aid in time of war for reasons but slightly different from those which summon all citizens to bear arms.

The attempt to pass this bill under the guise of legislation for the War or Navy Department is one that disposes me against it; but I believe that the measure has merits which justify it as legislation for our civil service.

My vote is for this bill on the same grounds that it would be for the pensioning of a policeman, a fireman, or a school-teacher who had grown old in the public service, and I do not propose to resort to the subterfuge of saying that the Revenue-Cutter crews are in the Navy. They are employed in most dangerous service, and will, of course, be serviceable in times of war. But they are not in the employ of the War or Navy Department. Their pay rolls are in the Treasury Department, and they are under the control of that Department. The trend of the age includes protection and support for those who grow old and incapacitated in service, and this whether the service is public or private. The great corporations of the country are moving in this direction, and it will make for the betterment of their relations with their employees. The dangers of a "retirement list" have been very much exaggerated, and if the civil service of this country could be so reformed as to abolish sinecures: if the Government could be placed in a position that it was called upon to pay only for work rendered, higher, better service would be promoted by a "retirement list," properly started and properly guarded. The trouble now is that the civil pay rolls of the National Government are, to an alarming extent, "retirement lists," upon which are found the names of those who render little or no service. Purge the civil lists of these names and the people will be willing to see a civil-service "retirement list" passed by any Congress. To those

who are advocating this bill, but declaring that they would not do so if it could be shown to open the way to a civil-service "retirement list," I beg to say that they are not deceiving even themselves. A good measure does not need the support of unsound pleading, and in casting my vote for the bill I desire to utterly reject the proposition that it is a measure connected with the Army or Navy Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be regarded as withdrawn. The Clerk will read the next section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That when a board finds that an officer is incapacitated for active service, and that his incapacity is the result of an incident of service, or is due to the infirmities of age, or physical or mental disability, and not his own vicious habits, and such decision is approved by the President, he shall be retired from active service and placed upon a retired waiting-orders list. Officers thus retired may be assigned to such duties as they may be able to perform, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 6 by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Provided, That no officer shall be placed on the retired waiting-orders list because of infirmity of age who has not served in the Revenue-Cutter Service at least forty years, and no officer shall be placed on said waiting-orders list by reason of physical or mental disability who has not served in the Revenue-Cutter Service at least twenty years, unless said physical or mental disability is the result of injury incurred in the line of active duty in the service."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the present provision is that a Revenue-Cutter officer must enlist in the service or enter the service as a cadet in the line before he is 23 years old. That is the regulation. The law, I believe, is 25 years. This amendment would prevent his retirement for age unless he had been in the service forty years, either in the Revenue-Cutter Service or in the Navy and the Revenue-Cutter Service combined. It seems to me that in addition to that it is a fair proposition that no officer in the Revenue-Cutter Service shall be retired for disability which is not incurred in the service unless he has been in the service for twenty years.

We know very well, every member of the House knows perfectly well, that the moment you permit a board of Revenue-Cutter officers to retire Revenue-Cutter officers we shall have the conditions in the Revenue-Cutter Service which Secretary Root says now exist in the Army service, and which Congress has been endeavoring to remedy in the Army service.

A retiring board of Revenue-Cutter officers has the incentive at once to retire officers in order to make places for the junior officers below them, and unless there is a limitation of some kind placed in the bill there will shortly be more Revenue-Cutter officers on the retired list than there are upon the active list.

The Secretary of War is now recommending that some provision be inserted covering the present trouble in reference to the Army retired list, and it occurs to me that it will not harm anybody to say that they shall not be retired for age short of forty years' service or for incapacity caused other than by injury in the service short of twenty years. I do not see how the gentleman can make any objection to that provision.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, this is a discrimination that applies to no other branch of the service, and is manifestly an attempt to fasten an unfriendly amendment upon the bill. I hope it will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That when any commissioned officer is retired from active service, the next officer in rank shall be promoted according to the established rules of the service, and the same rule of promotion shall be applied successively to the vacancies consequent upon such retirement: *Provided*, That all promotions shall be subject to examination to determine the professional qualifications of the candidates, and such examination shall be wholly written before a board of officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service, and their physical qualifications shall be reported upon by a board of medical officers of the Marine-Hospital Service; and such board shall be convened by the Secretary of the Treasury whenever the exigencies of the service require.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which will be reported by the Clerk.

Mr. MANN. I do this even at the risk of incurring the displeasure of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

The CHAIRMAN. One moment. Let the amendment be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 8, line 19, page 4, by striking out the words "according to the established rules of the service."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if anybody can tell me what the "established rules of the service" are, I shall be very much delighted to hear him. Here is a proposition absolutely taking out of the control of the President or of Congress, or out of the control of

the law, any question in regard to the promotion of officers. They shall be promoted according to the "established rules of the service"—rules which may be established now or rules which may be established hereafter. It is a queer provision to put in the law, notwithstanding the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who, with that versatility which he has, stands pat upon a proposition without regard to its reasoning.

I suppose the gentleman from Ohio is getting himself in preparation for forcing this side of the House to vote exactly as he demands that they shall vote upon the proposition for reciprocity with Cuba. It looks dangerous to see anybody offer an amendment to a bill, and I suggest his attitude as a fine example for the humorist from Maine, who, to his title of "expounder of the Constitution," has now added that of the "funny man from the Northeast." [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. I move to amend the amendment by striking out, after the word "service," the remainder of line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to amend the amendment by striking out, after the word "service," the remainder of line 18.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, this is clearly an unconstitutional law that we are passing. I am not surprised to see gentlemen laugh at the suggestion of the Constitution. "What is the Constitution, anyhow, between friends?" as has been suggested by a statesman.

A MEMBER. That suggestion originally came from the other side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Iowa kindly send up his amendment?

Mr. LACEY. It is simply to strike out all after the word "service" in line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that that should be offered as an independent amendment, rather than as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. LACEY. It is a part of the same proposition. I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if he will accept the amendment?

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the provision is.

Mr. LACEY. The amendment is to strike out the provision which requires the President to always promote the next man in rank.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be considered, but otherwise the Chair would have to rule it out of order at this time.

Mr. LACEY. No one has made the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. As there is no objection, the amendment will be considered.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that he was endeavoring to explain the point of the Constitution, and this was unconstitutional. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has the opinion of the gentleman from Maine upon the Constitution? [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. I think we can get at that by leaving out the constitutional question.

Mr. MANN. If you leave out the Constitution, there is no use of our considering the constitutional question.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I may not get the attention of the gentleman from Maine, but the Chair is a constitutional lawyer, and I will address him, and over his head the members of the committee. Here is a proposition that the next officer in rank shall in all cases be promoted, so that the next man is entitled to his promotion, without any reference to the fact that the Constitution of the United States, which creates so much amusement among some gentlemen here now, gives the appointing power to the President of the United States. I do not believe that we can constitutionally enact a law compelling the President of the United States in all cases to select the next man in rank for any office.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, this is the law of the country in regard to promotions in the Army and Navy, and has been for more than a hundred years; and the idea that the gentleman has fallen upon is a law of Congress attempting to compel an appointment by the President where no provision of law is made to appoint a certain man or a man of a certain rank. But the army organization to-day provides, and always has, that up to the rank of brigadier-general the next in seniority of service shall be promoted. "Shall be" is the language and always has been. That constitutional question that the gentleman presents does not come into this question in any way whatever.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio a question?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. MANN. Not in reference to that point, but in reference to another point in the same connection, which says that the promotion shall be subject to examination. That is in section 8. Now, I call the gentleman's attention to this point. Undoubtedly it is the design that the examination, both mental and physical,



shall be reported upon favorably. The bill does not so state, and I do not know whether that section as it stands is in conformity with the law relating to the Army and the Navy or not, though it may have a construction that way. It says it shall be subject to examination.

Mr. GROSVENOR. All promotions in the Army and Navy are made after examination.

Mr. MANN. I understand they are. "Subject to examination" is put in here. The law requires that the board shall report favorably both upon the mental and physical qualifications. Here it only says he shall be examined, but does not require that the examination shall be favorable.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is not serious in that.

Mr. MANN. I am serious.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am sorry if the gentleman is. That is always implied.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman can not answer—

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is implied, as a matter of course, that the examination for promotion shall result favorably. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. That all officers borne upon the retired or permanent waiting-orders list at the date of the passage of this act, or hereafter, shall receive 75 per cent of the duty pay, salary, and increase of the rank upon which they have been or may be retired.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to section 9 the following:

"Provided, That no such longevity increase of pay shall be allowed for any length of service after retirement."

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, this matter was discussed the other day on the Army appropriation bill, and the attempt was made to embody this provision in that bill, but a point of order was made that it changed existing law. It was conceded by everybody—

Mr. SHERMAN. The committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. LACEY. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 9 by striking out, after the word "officers," in line 5, the following: "Borne upon the retired or permanent waiting-orders list at the date of the passage of this act, or hereafter," and insert in place thereof the following: "hereafter placed upon the retired or permanent retired or waiting-orders list."

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered is aimed at one of the worst features of this bill—a bill, Mr. Chairman, whose supporters seem recklessly determined to pass it just as it is, regardless of consequences. Section 9 is in the nature of an ex post facto law. It is retroactive. It seems to me that it is a very rare emergency that makes it necessary for a law to be retroactive. Now, what occasion, what justice and fairness is there in framing this section as it reads and making it relate back to those on the "retired and waiting orders list" who now receive the handsome annuity of \$1,250?

These officers are simply incapable of rendering the Government any service. This law, retroactive as it is, goes back to those who are now on the retired list—the halt, the maimed—those whose health is gone, and takes men by the hand and brings them up and gives them the full benefit of the proposed law regardless of any service whatsoever. These men on the retired list are not complaining. Their compensation is ample. They are content with their labors and their pay, but to satisfy a vain and empty pride and ambition the Congress is asked to thrust its hand into the pockets of the taxpayers of this country and grant this unjust and unreasonable demand for increased pay on a civil pension list.

This section of the bill is offensive, Mr. Chairman, in every respect and in defiance of those great principles and dictates of common justice and common sense prevailing in the minds of the people of this country that a law or statute ought not to be retroactive; it ought not to go back and put a man in a far better position pecuniarily to-day than he was when he accepted retirement of his own volition and on his own application. That is what this section means. It reads "upon which they have been or may be retired."

Why, Mr. Chairman, what justification can we give for that? Have these men on this retired or waiting-orders list given any additional reason since their voluntary retirement why they should be made the recipients of this generous bounty? They are not capable of rendering any service. Is this any reason for paying them a higher salary than when they were on the active list? Is it for services that they have rendered in the past? If so, then the law has already paid them. They are now on the "retired list on waiting orders." This section is really one of the most objectionable features in the whole bill. I know, Mr. Chairman, that some of the supporters of this bill apparently are careless and indifferent as to its real purport. This is a Senate bill that we are considering, and when this House passes it, as it seems determined to do, the chances are that it will become a law of the land. It will not be the last of it. It will come back to us in the shape of numberless demands to place other just as worthy, just as courageous and efficient servants and employees of the Government on a retired civil-pension list for life. I can see them now in the future coming in troops to this Capitol.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, when the naval personnel bill was passed, this identical question was presented which the gentleman from Alabama presents by his amendment. We have heard all this talk about placing the officers of the Revenue-Cutter Service on a par with the Navy. The personnel bill excepted the officers of the retired list of the Navy so that under that bill the officers of the Navy who had been retired prior to that time received no benefit from the passage of that bill. But here is a proposition to increase the pay of the captains of the Revenue-Cutter Service now under permanent waiting orders, placed there at their own request, to increase the pay from \$1,250 to \$2,625 each year.

Now, when this House refuses to pass a pension bill above \$72 a month—and I think there has been only one of that kind—they propose to increase by more than \$100 a month the retired officers in the Revenue-Cutter Service, who are already there at their own request. What is the justice of that? These men are retired; they are placed on the permanent waiting-orders list under an act of Congress which they petitioned for themselves. We refused to do it for the Navy. We ought not to do it now for the Revenue-Cutter Service.

It is easy for the gentleman from Ohio to say that those of us who are opposed to the passage of the bill ought not to have anything to say about the amendments; that is within the power of the majority of the House. It is within their power to prevent us, but it is not within their power to prevent our expressing reasons which, if they overcome by votes, they will find will come back to plague them in the future.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to speak in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I desire to favor the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid my friend has not read this section. It reads:

That all officers borne upon the retired waiting-orders list at the date of the passage of this act, or hereafter, shall receive 75 per cent of the duty pay, salary, and increase of the rank upon which they have been or may be retired.

I do not understand that that increases the pay of the man that has been retired.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. HEPBURN. For what purpose?

Mr. MANN. To ask a question.

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I want to ask him whether the word "rank" is not the word referred to by the words "have been?"

Mr. HEPBURN (reading):

Shall receive 75 per cent of the duty pay, salary, and increase of the rank upon which they have been or may be retired.

I think that must refer to the pay. You can not get 75 per cent increase of rank, and therefore you have to take 75 per cent increase of pay that they receive at the time they were retired.

Besides, Mr. Chairman, this is rather a small matter. There are only a few of these old men. They are very old men. All of them were retired a good many years ago. They were not retired upon their own request, but they were retired because for a long time they had been incapacitated for service. They were retired upon a bill passed upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, in order that these incapacitated men, incapacitated at that time largely from age, give place to younger men. I doubt if there are any of these men under 70 years of age. I think there are but 23 in all, and they have served more than forty years, the greater number of them. I think the gentleman, with his zeal, might at least take his rough hand off from these old men and let them get into their graves with something of comfort. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I have just as much sympathy for the "old men" as has the gentleman from Iowa. In fact, I believe I am somewhat older, at least in spirit, than the gentleman, and therefore ought to have more sympathy for the "old men." I cheerfully concede that I can not equal the gentleman from Iowa in enthusiasm, while I am inclined always to lean upon his elder judgment.

But let me say that many of these men on the permanent waiting-orders list are not old men. I have before me the record of one who was born September 17, 1862—not an old man—retired upon the application of Revenue-Cutter officers who asked Congress to pass an act retiring him on a fair salary. He was retired before he had ever performed much service. Why should he be paid any better than the veterans of the civil war whose cases we now quibble about when it comes to paying them a pension of any size?

Mr. HEPBURN. That man was retired because he was insane, was he not? And he receives, I believe, \$900 a year.

Mr. MANN. I do not know for what he was retired. He was a second assistant engineer. There are three second assistant engineers on this list, and a number of other officers below the rank of captain and chief engineer, who are not retired on account of old age at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as I understood the argument of the chairman of the committee, the closing part of his statement was that these men who are on the retired list will receive the increased pay under this bill, as originally stated by the gentleman from Illinois. In other words, if we pass this bill there are a number of men now retired from this service and receiving \$1,250 a year to whom, without rhyme or reason or excuse, we are going to pay for the balance of their lives, without requiring any service from them, \$2,500 a year from the Treasury of the United States. This is something that has never been known before, I warrant, in the history of the legislation of this country. Under the guise of a bill "to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service," we are to take a number of men who have been retired from that service, upon whom the Government has no claim, and upon whom it never expects to have any claim in the future—men who have been retired under former law by former Secretaries, and who have been receiving \$1,250 a year—we are to take those men, and, simply because they have friends in this court, to pay them \$2,500 a year out of the public Treasury. That is a fair sample of this bill. It is about all there is in it.

While this is denominated "a bill to increase the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service," it carries a fraud in its title, because that is not its object. There is not a man on this floor who has risen in advocacy of the bill who has not contended that this is now the most efficient service in the United States. But along the same line, we propose to give these retired gentlemen, who are now out of this service, earning their living, perhaps, in some other way and having control of their own time, \$1,250 a year as a bonus out of the Federal Treasury, that belongs to your constituents and mine. We propose to treat these gentlemen thus munificently because they have some good friends here who want them to get this increase. That is about all the merit there is in the bill, so far as I can see, from beginning to end, because, as I have said, not a man who has advocated the bill, so far as I have heard, has contended for one moment that "the efficiency of the service" is going to be increased by the measure. The friends of the bill have spent their time on this floor telling us how efficient this service has been under the law in the past.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will give me a moment or two.

Mr. SHERMAN. Very well; I make it one minute.

Mr. MANN. Let me have two or three minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move to close debate in two minutes.

The motion of Mr. SHERMAN was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill the meaning of this language used in the pending section: "Duty pay, salary." What is the difference between "duty pay" and "salary?" What is the reason for putting this language in the bill? There must be some reason for it. What does the language mean? Does it mean that "duty pay" is one thing and "salary" another thing—something additional?

Mr. SHERMAN. The language is precisely the same as that used in the Navy bill.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I understand not.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand it is. I am so advised by a member of the Naval Committee, a member who was very much interested in the drafting and passage of the naval personnel bill.

Mr. MANN. I was informed by an officer in the office of the paymaster of the Navy and the Army both that there was no such thing in either the Army or the Navy.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am differently informed.

Mr. MANN. Well, what does it mean? The gentleman must know whether "duty pay" means so much money, and "salary" means so much more, and "increase" so much more. We know what increase means; it means 10 per cent additional for each five years' service. But I would like to know if the gentleman is willing to acquaint us as to whether "duty pay" and "salary" are two different things, and what they are. If the gentleman does not understand this bill, why he might give some of the rest of us an opportunity to explain, without cutting off debate. I yield to the gentleman the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I—

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate has expired. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will read.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I withdraw that for the moment, Mr. Chairman. I want to offer it after the vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama, to strike out certain words and insert certain other words.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 9, after the word "retired," in line 9, insert the words: "Provided further, That officers on the waiting list shall be retired at 75 per cent of the rate of pay and allowance to which they were entitled when placed on the waiting list."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 9 by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Provided, That no person by reason of the provisions of this section shall be paid at the rate of more than \$100 per calendar month."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHAFROTH) there were ayes 36, noes 92.

So the motion was lost.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 9, line 8, by striking out the words "duty and salary."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk then continued and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I withdraw the motion temporarily, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by striking out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to strike out the enacting clause in the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division, called for by Mr. MANN, there were—ayes 44, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. OLMSTED, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (S. 1025) and had instructed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.



Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask the previous question on the bill and amendments to passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York demands the previous question on the bill and amendments to passage.

Mr. MANN. The hour of 5 o'clock having been reached, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 115.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

After counting the House, the Speaker announced 189 members (a quorum) present.

Accordingly the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] to order the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded upon any amendment? If not, they will be submitted to the House in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill. Mr. MANN. I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the passage of the bill. The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN demanded a division.

Mr. GLENN demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 134, nays 49, answered "present" 19, not voting 153, as follows:

## YEAS—134.

Adams,	Darragh,	Hill,	Payne,
Adamson,	Davey, La.	Howell,	Pearre,
Alexander,	Davidson,	Jack,	Perkins,
Allen, Me.	Davis, Fla.	Jenkins,	Prince,
Aplin,	Decmer,	Jones, Wash.	Pugsley,
Beidler,	Dick,	Kahn,	Ray, N. Y.
Bell,	Draper,	Knapp,	Roberts,
Bellamy,	Edwards,	Kyle,	Russell,
Belmont,	Elliott,	Landis,	Ryan,
Bowie,	Emerson,	Lessler,	Salmon,
Brantley,	Esch,	Lever,	Scarborough,
Breazeale,	Evans,	Lindsay,	Schirm,
Brick,	Finley,	Littauer,	Shallenberger,
Bristow,	Fitzgerald,	Littlefield,	Sherman,
Broussard,	Fletcher,	McDermott,	Smith, Ill.
Brown,	Fordney,	McLachlan,	Smith, H. C.
Bull,	Foster, Vt.	Mahon,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Burke, S. Dak.	Gardner, N. J.	Marshall,	Southwick,
Burleigh,	Gibson,	Martin,	Sperry,
Butler, Pa.	Gillet, N. Y.	Metcalf,	Stewart, N. Y.
Calderhead,	Goldfogle,	Meyer, La.	Sulzer,
Cassel,	Graff,	Minor,	Sutherland,
Conner,	Graham,	Moody, N. C.	Tawney,
Coombs,	Green, Pa.	Moody, Oreg.	Taylor, Ohio
Cooper, Wis.	Greene, Mass.	Morgan,	Thomas, N. C.
Corliss,	Griffith,	Morris,	Tompkins, Ohio
Cousins,	Grosvenor,	Moss,	Vreeland,
Cromer,	Grow,	Mudd,	Wachter,
Crowley,	Hall,	Mutchler,	Wanger,
Currier,	Hamilton,	Napen,	Weeks,
Curtis,	Haskins,	Nevin,	Wilson,
Cushman,	Hedge,	Olmsted,	Woods.
Dahle,	Hemenway,	Otjen,	
Dalzell,	Hepburn,	Patterson, Pa.	

## NAYS—49.

Allen, Ky.	Gillett, Mass.	Mondell,	Shafroth,
Ball, Tex.	Glenn,	Moody, Mass.	Sims,
Burkett,	Henry, Miss.	Moon,	Smith, Ky.
Burleson,	Johnson,	Needham,	Stark,
Candler,	Jones, Va.	Neville,	Underwood,
Cannon,	Kleberg,	Padgett,	Warner,
Cochran,	Lacey,	Palmer,	Wheeler,
De Armond,	Lawrence,	Reeder,	White,
Dinsmore,	Little,	Reid,	Williams, Ill.
Driscoll,	Lloyd,	Richardson, Tenn.	Zenor.
Fleming,	Long,	Robb,	
Fox,	Loud,	Robinson, Nebr.	
Gardner, Mich.	Mann,	Selby,	
Bartlett,	Hooker,	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, S. W.
Clark,	Irwin,	Miers, Ind.	Snodgrass,
Clayton,	Jett,	Miller,	Tirrell,
Crumpacker,	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Pierce,	Vandiver.
Hitt,	Kluttz,	Richardson, Ala.	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—19.

## NOT VOTING—153.

Acheson,	Feely,	Livingston,	Sheppara,
Babcock,	Flood,	Loudenslager,	Showalter
Ball, Del.	Foerderer,	Lovering,	Sibley,
Bankhead,	Foss,	McAndrews,	Skiles,
Barney,	Foster, Ill.	McCall,	Slayden,
Bartholdt,	Fowler,	McCleary,	Small,
Bates,	Gaines, Tenn.	McClellan,	Smith, Iowa
Benton,	Gaines, W. Va.	McCulloch,	Snook,
Bingham,	Gilbert,	McLain,	Southard,
Bishop,	Gill,	McRae,	Sparkman,
Blackburn,	Gooch,	Maddox,	Spight,
Blakeney,	Gordon,	Mahoney,	Steele,
Boreing,	Griggs,	Maynard,	Stephens, Tex.
Boutell,	Hanbury,	Mercer,	Stevens, Minn.
Bowersock,	Haugen,	Mickey,	Stewart, N. J.
Brownlow,	Hay,	Morrell,	Storm,
Brundidge,	Heatwole,	Newlands,	Sulloway,
Burgess,	Henry, Conn.	Norton,	Swanson,
Burk, Pa.	Henry, Tex.	Otey,	Talbert,
Burnett,	Hildebrandt,	Overstreet,	Tate,
Burton,	Holliday,	Parker,	Taylor, Ala.
Butler, Mo.	Hopkins,	Patterson, Tenn.	Thayer,
Caldwell,	Howard,	Pou,	Thomas, Iowa
Capron,	Hughes,	Powers, Me.	Thompson,
Cassingham,	Hull,	Powers, Mass.	Tompkins, N. Y.
Connell,	Jackson, Kans.	Randell, Tex.	Tongue,
Conry,	Jackson, Md.	Ransdell, La.	Trimble,
Cooney,	Joy,	Reeves,	Van Voorhis,
Cooper, Tex.	Kehoe,	Rhea, Va.	Wadsworth,
Cowherd,	Kern,	Rixey,	Warnock,
Creamer,	Ketcham,	Robertson, La.	Watson,
Cummings,	Kitchin, Claude	Robinson, Ind.	Wiley,
Dayton,	Knox,	Rucker,	Williams, Miss.
De Graffenreid,	Lamb,	Rumple,	Wooten,
Dougherty,	Lanham,	Ruppert,	Wright,
Douglas,	Lassiter,	Scott,	Young.
Dovener,	Latimer,	Shackelford,	
Eddy,	Lester,	Shattuc,	
	Lewis, Ga.	Shelden,	

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. HOLLIDAY with Mr. BURGESS.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. IRWIN with Mr. GOOCH.

Mr. CAPRON with Mr. JETT.

Mr. OVERSTREET with Mr. COWHERD.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS with Mr. GORDON.

Mr. BARNEY with Mr. MCRAE.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. PIERCE.

Mr. SKILES with Mr. TALBERT.

Mr. RUMPLE with Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. MERCER with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. WOOTEN.

Mr. SHELLEN with Mr. FEELY.

Mr. REEVES with Mr. HENRY of Texas.

Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. EDDY with Mr. SHEPPARD.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. SNODGRASS.

Mr. HULL with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Mr. MCCALL with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

For this session:

Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. CASSINGHAM.

Mr. HEATWOLE with Mr. TATE.

Mr. YOUNG with Mr. BENTON.

Mr. BOREING with Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. WATSON with Mr. MIERS of Indiana, until Saturday.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. RUCKER, one week.

For this day:

Mr. BOUTELL with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. FOERDERER with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. BOWERSOCK with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. COONEY.

Mr. GILL with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. SWANSON.

Mr. BALL of Delaware with Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama.

Mr. FOSS with Mr. BUTLER of Missouri.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. MCCLELLAN.

Mr. KNOX with Mr. RIXEY.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana.

Mr. BURTON with Mr. KEHOE.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BARTLETT.

Mr. MORRELL with Mr. DOUGHERTY.

Mr. WARNOCK with Mr. SNOOK.

On this vote:

Mr. WADSWORTH with Mr. WILEY.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. POU.

Mr. SOUTHARD with Mr. MICKEY.

Mr. SIBLEY with Mr. NEWLANDS.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. McLAIN.

Mr. STORM with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. PARKER with Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. McCLEARY with Mr. LIVINGSTON.  
 Mr. JACKSON of Maryland with Mr. KERN.  
 Mr. HILDEBRANT with Mr. JACKSON of Kansas.  
 Mr. DAYTON with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.  
 Mr. SHATTUC with Mr. RHEA of Virginia.  
 Mr. LOVERING with Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 Mr. BATES with Mr. MADDOX.  
 Mr. DOUGLAS with Mr. SPIGHT.  
 Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. SHACKLEFORD.  
 Mr. JOY with Mr. CLAUDE KITCHIN.  
 Mr. SULLOWAY with Mr. COOPER of Texas.  
 Mr. BLAKENEY with Mr. LANHAM.  
 Mr. POWERS of Maine with Mr. POWERS of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. RUPPERT with Mr. SPARKMAN.  
 Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania with Mr. HUGHES.  
 Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH with Mr. TONGUE.  
 Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. GAINES of Tennessee.  
 Mr. LASSITER with Mr. MAHONEY.  
 Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania with Mr. GAINES of West Virginia.  
 Mr. CONRY with Mr. THAYER.  
 Mr. TOMPKINS of New York with Mr. TIRRELL.  
 Mr. CUMMINGS with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.  
 Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama.  
 Mr. HANBURY with Mr. GRIGGS.  
 Mr. LATIMER with Mr. VANDIVER.  
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. BURNETT.  
 Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. KLUTTZ.  
 Mr. RANSEDELL of Louisiana with Mr. MILLER.  
 Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana with Mr. MCANDREWS.  
 Mr. CREAMER with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois.  
 Mr. HOPKINS with Mr. HITT.  
 Mr. MAYNARD with Mr. CLARK.  
 Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. LAMB.  
 Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. THOMAS of Iowa.  
 Mr. OTEY with Mr. HAY.  
 Mr. LESTER with Mr. BISHOP.  
 Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. SULLOWAY. If he were present, I would vote "nay."

The SPEAKER. That is not in order. Does the gentleman desire to change his vote to "present?"

Mr. COOPER of Texas. I have not voted.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. SHERMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. PUGSLEY obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John Percival, Twenty-second Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12095. An act to amend section 4883 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the signing of letters patent for inventions;

H. R. 1278. An act granting an increase of pension to La Myra V. Kendig;

H. R. 1503. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Farrell;

H. R. 2287. An act granting an increase of pension to George McDaniel;

H. R. 6918. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss;

H. R. 6016. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Overman;

H. R. 610. An act to correct the military record of John F. Antlitz;

H. R. 9848. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Cowgill;

H. R. 6498. An act granting an increase of pension to Matthew C. Medbury;

H. R. 2545. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Crim;

H. R. 7811. An act granting a pension to Mary King;

H. R. 7250. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Henry;

H. R. 5712. An act granting a pension to Alice Bozeman;

H. R. 1275. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Thomas;

H. R. 5327. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Mackey;

H. R. 1190. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Whittier;

H. R. 5761. An act granting a pension to Thomas F. Walter;

H. R. 3275. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Johnson;

H. R. 6687. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Blackman;

H. R. 809. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Burchfield;

H. R. 1714. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi H. Winslow;

H. R. 725. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Arbaugh;

H. R. 1938. An act granting an increase of pension to Helen V. Rorer;

H. R. 8048. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Bramble;

H. R. 10141. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Armstrong;

H. R. 10415. An act granting a pension to Sarah M. Smith;

H. R. 8651. An act granting a pension to Maggie Helmbold;

H. R. 918. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Misner;

H. R. 283. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert M. McCullough;

H. R. 8471. An act granting a pension to Eliza A. Wright;

H. R. 10692. An act granting an increase of pension to David C. Maples;

H. R. 11053. An act providing for the issuance of patents to the town site of Basin City, Wyo., to the municipal authorities thereof for the use and benefit of said town, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6196. An act transferring a lot in Woodland Cemetery to city of Quincy, Ill.;

H. R. 9621. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Y. Transue; and

H. R. 9791. An act granting an increase of pension to John Reep.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3231. An act to legalize and maintain a new steel bridge erected in the place of the old wooden structure, across the Little Tennessee River at Niles Ferry, Tennessee, by the Atlanta, Knoxville, and Northern Railroad.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 167. An act for the relief of John L. Smithmeyer and Paul J. Pelz—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3437. An act to amend chapter 4, Title XIII, of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4339. An act authorizing the White River Railway Company to construct a bridge across the White River in Arkansas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 4222. An act authorizing the appointment of John Russell Bartlett, a captain on the retired list of the Navy, as a rear-admiral on the retired list of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 3633. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Leffingwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1814. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Luke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4404. An act granting an increase of pension to Otto H. Haselman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1107. An act limiting the liability of sureties on bonds of officers of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1643. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen J. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4450. An act confirming in the State of South Dakota title to a section of land heretofore granted to said State—to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1451. An act to correct the military record of A. W., alias Washington, Huntley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3797. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver old pieces of ordnance to the Indian war veterans—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. R. 23. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish condemned cannon for a statue of the late Maj. Gen. Alexander Macomb, U. S. A.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3821. An act to extend the time for presentation of claims under the act entitled "An act to reimburse the governors of States and Territories for expenses incurred by them in aiding the United States to raise and organize and supply and equip the Volunteer Army of the United States in the existing war with Spain," approved July 8, 1898, and under acts amendatory thereof—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 4572. An act to grant an honorable discharge from the



military service to Charles H. Hawley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4740. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Godfrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 319. An act granting an increase of pension to Ida Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2289. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Harrower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4514. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Beals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3108. An act granting an increase of pension to Inez E. Perrine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 438. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 2943. An act granting a pension to Thomas S. Rowan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 181. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. David—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3672. An act granting an increase of pension to James Scannell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3041. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Shilling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4792. An act relative to the control of dogs in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4643. An act granting an increase of pension to Phoebe L. Peyton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 3634. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Capehart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4056. An act granting an increase of pension to Minerva Melton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1625. An act granting an increase of pension to Jethro M. Getman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 4335. An act granting an increase of pension to John Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURK of Pennsylvania for three days, on account of important business.

#### FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the bill (H. R. 13359) making appropriations for fortifications and other works defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes. I desire to serve notice that immediately after the Chinese-exclusion bill is disposed of I will call it up.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana reports from the Committee on Appropriations the fortification appropriation bill, which will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I present the following report on an urgent deficiency bill (H. R. 13360) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reports an urgent deficiency bill. Does the gentleman desire to call it up to-night?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I think I will let it be printed, and ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### CHINESE-EXCLUSION ACT.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice that I will endeavor to get the House to take up the Chinese-exclusion bill to-morrow.

#### LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that members who have spoken on the Revenue-Cutter bill be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD within five days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that members who have spoken on the Revenue-Cutter bill have leave to extend their remarks, for five days, in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the House adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

And accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of William S. Tildon against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a communication from Brig. Gen. Leonard Wood, military governor of Cuba, in relation to resolution of inquiry passed by the House—to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting an estimate of appropriation for improvements and repairs—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STORM, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6714) for the relief of Alexander S. Rosenthal, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1320); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1512) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Faulkner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1321); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Louise Ward, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1322); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1678) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Wingfield, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1323); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3103) granting an increase of pension to Susan Hays, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1324); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4072) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Lambden, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1325); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SELBY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5877) granting a pension to Robert Watts, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1326); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BALL of Delaware, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6434) granting a pension to Mary Fitch, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1327); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3277) granting a pension to Mrs. Frances J. Abercrombie, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1328); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12576) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wells, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1329); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7922) granting an increase of pension to R. G. Watkins, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1330); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11181) granting a pension to Alice D. H. Krause, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1331); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11787) granting a pension to

John J. Manner, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1332); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROMWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5186) granting a pension to John Canter, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1333); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk, and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6454) for the relief of Thomas F. Tobey, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1334); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8544) to place Elias H. Parsons on the retired list of the United States Army, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1335); which said bill and report were laid on the table.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills; which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2794) granting an increase of pension to Bethany Simmons—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13218) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Karns—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13275) granting an increase of pension to George F. White—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 13325) to amend section 6 of "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 13326) to provide for a national park commission—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOWLER (by instruction of the majority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency): A bill (H. R. 13327) to maintain the gold standard, provide an elastic currency, equalize the rates of interest throughout the country, and further amend the national banking laws—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRIS: A bill (H. R. 13328) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota," approved January 14, 1889—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 13354) to continue the publication of the Supplement to the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMENWAY, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 13359) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations: A bill (H. R. 13360) making appropriations to supply additional urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. CORLISS: A resolution (H. Res. 199) concerning rule for the consideration of H. R. 5—to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAKENEY: A bill (H. R. 13329) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 13330) granting an increase of pension to Emil Schincke—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW: A bill (H. R. 13331) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Donohoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 13332) granting an increase of pension to W. G. Cantley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 13333) for the relief of Walter F. Suiter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEMENWAY: A bill (H. R. 13334) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William C. Goodman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 13335) to provide an American register for the bark *Homeward Bound*—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: A bill (H. R. 13336) for the relief of Samuel Snyder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13337) for the relief of Charles Mohn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 13338) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wittenbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13339) to remove charge of desertion from record of Daniel L. Tate—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13340) to remove charge of desertion from record of John B. Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13341) to remove charge of desertion from record of James Kane—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13342) to remove charge of desertion from record of Albert W. Keller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13343) to remove charge of desertion from record of Anton Smith, alias Charles Roehmer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEWLANDS: A bill (H. R. 13344) for the relief of Anna Eliza Isabella von Hemert—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWERS of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13345) granting a pension to Celestia A. Whitney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 13346) for the relief of Isaac Fry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 13347) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Mayhew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 13348) granting an increase of pension to Simon McCalla—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13349) granting a pension Malissa Thomas—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 13350) granting a pension to Presley P. Medlin—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOMPKINS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 13351) granting an increase of pension to Clara J. King—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 13352) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13353) granting an increase of pension to George Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 13355) granting an increase of pension to William H. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 13356) for the relief of the legal representatives of Edward Lupton, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 13357) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Huff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 13358) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Wilder—to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of Levi W. Bissett and others of Deep Valley, Pa., relating to pending reciprocity treaties and concessions—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Polish Society of Oliver, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ADAMS: Petition of Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, relating to licensing marine engineers—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, favoring House bill 5796, to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Osawatimie Division, No. 137, Order of Railway Conductors, of Kansas, favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRICK: Resolutions of Branch No. 83, Polish National



Society, of South Bend, Ind., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Clerks' Union of Elkhart, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of Matthias A. Cullnan, of Belfast, Me., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of Libby Post, No. 93, Litchfield, Me., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the construction of naval vessels at Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: Resolutions of Retail Clerks' Union of Gadsden, Ala., in favor of Senate bill 1891 and the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill 13355, granting an increase of pension to William H. Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROMER: Resolution of Muncie Lodge, No. 20, of Muncie, Ind., in favor of Senate bill 1118, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy," etc., in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Papers to accompany House bill 12359, granting a pension to George F. Flinn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Farmington, Exeter, and Swiftwater, N. H., for an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen of West Philadelphia, Pa., on the subject of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring a Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring an amendment to the Constitution making polygamy a crime—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen of Pittston and Connellsville, Pa.; Order of Railway Conductors of Renova and Meadville, Pa., and Memphis, Tenn., and Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Braddock, Dubois, Clearfield, Harrisburg, Meadville, and Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Hoar-Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petitions of citizens of Salona, Flemington, and Williamsport, Pa., to abolish saloons and legalized vice in the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of Rev. G. F. Hall and others, of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Petitions of Miners' Union No. 103, of Marysville, and Cooper City Lodge, No. 500, Locomotive Firemen, Anaconda, Mont., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of board of aldermen of New York City, urging an appropriation for the improvement of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FOSS: Memorial of the First Reformed Presbyterian Church of Chicago, Ill., for the amendment or radical modification of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 20, Waukegan, Ill., favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Second Branch Society of Engineers, Chicago, Ill., favoring an educational restriction on immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Resolution of the United Retail Grocers' Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of Building Trades Council of Yonkers, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Eight-Hour League of America, in support of a national eight-hour day—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolutions of Farragut Post, No. 4, Vallejo, Cal., Grand Army of the Republic, and Manufacturers' Association of New York, favoring the building of war ships in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of National Association of Clothiers, and Standard Varnish Works, New York City, in favor of amendments to the bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of the Manufacturers' Association of New York, favoring House bill 9056, known as the Babcock bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Chamber of Commerce, of

Manila, urging certain legislation for the Philippines—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of the League of American Sportsmen, favoring the passage of House bill 10306, for the preservation of wild animals and game birds—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions of Carpenters' Union No. 699, of Sewickley, Pa., for the passage of House bill 9330, for a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of the New Century Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., for securing a national forest reserve in the Appalachian Mountains—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of Stone Masons' Union No. 38, of Reading, Pa., for the passage of House bill 9330, for a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Reading, Pa., for an amendment to the Constitution preventing polygamous marriages—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANBURY: Resolutions of board of aldermen of New York City, urging appropriation for the deepening and dredging of Buttermilk Channel, New York Bay—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Resolutions of Polish Societies of New Britain and Collinsville, Conn., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Bakers' Union No. 8, of Hartford, Conn., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Labor Union No. 8, of Hartford; Plasterers' Union No. 20, of South Manchester; Bricklayers and Masons' Union No. 20, of Manchester, Conn., favoring the reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Resolutions of Coopers' Union No. 2, of New York, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KNOX: Resolutions of Young Men's Polish Society No. 39, of Lowell, Mass., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Painters' Union No. 39, of Lowell, Mass., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LASSITER: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, N. C., in regard to an inland waterway from Chesapeake Bay to Beaufort Inlet—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolutions of the board of aldermen of New York City, in favor of the construction of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MANN: Resolutions of Boot and Shoe Workers' Union No. 151, of West Pullman, Ill., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of E. B. Carr Lodge, No. 115, of Freeport, Ill., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, favoring the passage of the Foraker-Corliss safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Resolutions of the Board of Trade and Business Men's Association of Norfolk, Va.; also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Elizabeth City, N. C., for the improvement of inland navigation between the port of Norfolk and Portsmouth, Va., and Beaufort Inlet, North Carolina—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions of Painters and Decorators' Union No. 519, of Newport News, favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Central Labor Union of Norfolk, Va., favoring the continued exclusion of Chinese laborers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Resolutions of the board of aldermen of New York City, in favor of the construction of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Resolutions of Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 170, Vincennes, Ind., favoring a reenactment of the Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: Petition of Greenhorn Mount Miners' Union, No. 132, of Geiser, Oreg., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Cornucopia Union, No. 91, W. F. of M., of Cornucopia, Oreg., and of Cigar Makers' Union No. 202, of Portland, Oreg., for further restriction of Chinese and Asiatic immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Polish Society of Portland, Oreg., favoring the passage of House bill 16—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 202, of Portland, Oreg., in regard to the reduction of duty on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Roseburg Division, No. 1, Brotherhood of Railway Employees, Roseburg, Oreg., for the establishment of a postal savings department—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Petition of Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, Westchester, Pa., in favor of the passage of House bill 5796, to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PALMER: Petitions of Polish Young Men's Alliance, Plymouth, Pa., and Polish Society No. IX, of Duryea, Pa., favoring House bill 16, for the erection of an equestrian statue of the late General Pulaski at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania: Resolutions of Polish Societies of Middleport, Mahoney City, New Philadelphia, and Shenandoah, Pa., favoring the erection of a statue to the late Brigadier-General Count Pulaski at Washington—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Resolutions of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Binghamton, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUCKER: Protest of merchants of Madison, Mo., against House bill 6578, known as the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolutions of board of aldermen of New York City, urging an appropriation for the improvement of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of board of aldermen of New York City, favoring dredging and deepening of Buttermilk Channel, in bay of New York—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCHIRM: Resolutions of Granite Cutters' Union of Baltimore, Md., favoring the construction of war vessels in the United States navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Petition of J. E. Pulver and other citizens of Kearney County, Nebr., for the passage of House bills 178 and 179—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13318, granting an increase of pension to Fergus P. McMillan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13316, granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Olcott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: Paper to accompany House bill 13349, granting a pension to Malissa Thomas, of Antwerp, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 13348, granting an increase of pension to Simon McCalla, of Hicksville, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STARK: Resolution of John W. McConiff Division, No. 246, Railway Conductors, Wymore, Nebr., favoring a further restriction of Chinese immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Morton Post, No. 17, Hebron, Nebr., Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the building of war ships in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions of Cigar Makers' Union, and Boot and Shoe Cutters' Union No. 281, of St. Paul, Minn., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of board of aldermen of the city of New York, urging an appropriation for the improvement of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Joseph P. Dillin and other citizens of Ardmore, Pa., for a game preserve in Alaska and the passage of House bill 11535—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, protest of A. S. Cadwallader and other citizens of Yardley, Pa., against any action which will injure any American industry—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of Caroline L. Harrison Circle, No. 78, Ladies of Grand Army of the Republic, Pottstown, Pa., favoring a bill providing pensions to certain officers and men in the Army and Navy and increasing widows' pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of Rose Hill Post, No. 158, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, favoring an investigation of the administration of the Commissioner of Pensions—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, resolution of Macedonia Post, No. 469, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, favoring the building of war ships in the navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON: Resolutions of board of aldermen of New York City, asking for the improvement of Buttermilk Channel—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WOODS: Papers to accompany House bill 13321 granting an increase of pension to John S. Bonham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Iron Trades Council of San Francisco, Cal., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolution of Shirt, Waist, and Laundry Workers' Union No. 10, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Naval Command No. 1, Camp No. 91, Spanish-American War Veterans, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1220—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association No. 13, of Philadelphia, Pa., relating to licensing marine engineers—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, April 4, 1902.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

JOHN W. DANIEL, a Senator from the State of Virginia, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CULLOM, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

### HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION, ARK.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 2d instant, a report by Prof. J. K. Haywood of analysis of the water of the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark., and a geological sketch of the Hot Springs Reservation, by Prof. Walter H. Weed; which, on motion of Mr. BERRY, were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

### RAILROADS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 18th ultimo, a statement of the legal and traffic relations between the railroads in the Philippine Islands as to the charters and ownership thereof; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed.

### CHIPPEWA INDIANS IN MINNESOTA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and accompanying copy of an agreement with the Red Lake and Pembina bands of Chippewa Indians in Minnesota for the cession and relinquishment to the United States of the western portion of the Red Lake Reservation, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed with amendments the bill (S. 1025) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue-Cutter Service in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 3231) to legalize and maintain a new steel bridge erected in place of the old wooden structure across the Little Tennessee River at Niles Ferry, Tenn., by the Atlanta, Knoxville and Northern Railroad;

A bill (H. R. 283) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. McCullough;

A bill (H. R. 610) to correct the military record of John F. Antlitz;

A bill (H. R. 725) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Arbaugh;

A bill (H. R. 809) granting an increase of pension to James P. Burchfield;

A bill (H. R. 918) granting an increase of pension to Charles Misner;

A bill (H. R. 1190) granting an increase of pension to Albert S. Whittier;